UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. XIII SUMMER, 1961 No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Current Trends in Catholic Ecumenism

DANIEL STIERNON, A. A.

Pope John XXIII and the Christian East, Part II

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

Personalities of the Council of Florence
VII. The Emperor, John VIII Palaeologus

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Unity Conference of the Friars of the Atonement
A Debate on Christian Unity in the House of Lords

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR, GARRISON, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

✠ Hector Cunial
Archiep. tit. Soteropolitan., Vicesgerens

Rome, July 19, 1961.

ROMAE PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

CURRENT TRENDS IN CATHOLIC ECUMENISM *

The subject which was entrusted to me, and which I accepted in the spirit of collaboration — « Current Trends in Catholic Ecumenism » — placed me in an embarrassing position. Yes, there are different trends in Catholic ecumenism, and not everybody follows the one I do. If I should present them all and refrain from making judgment, if that were possible, it would not be a very useful thing. Should I, instead, indicate a preference, even if I were to justify it — indeed, especially if I were to justify it, I would risk giving displeasure to colleagues of mine in the same great cause of Christian Unity. Even so, it seemed to me that in this case of differing points of view, it would be worthwhile to face them in a brotherly way, so as to let the best man win, or so as to piece together the best elements that each of them has to offer.

There thus remained merely the manner of how best to proceed. One way of treating the subject of the present trends of Catholic ecumenism would be to analyze the rather numerous books which deal with this matter and to study the organizations whose purpose is ecumenical action. I am afraid that this method would be quite long and would risk running into confusion and making repetitions. I have found it preferable to distinguish the principle questions entailed in ecumenism, and seek the different solutions proposed for each. In this way I trust that the essential will be said, and that it will be clearer when disengaged.

Since ecumenism consists in entering into relation with confessions other than one's own so as to promote Christian Unity with a common effort, one meets with a preliminary and fundamental question: Should not a Catholic agree to deal with non-Catholics on an equal footing? It is understood that here we are not speaking of personal attitudes: a Christian can never have too much humility and consideration for others. It is rather a matter of doctrine. The Catholic believes, not in the sense of opinion, but with all the certitude afforded him by the faith, that his Church is the sole Church of Christ. Will this conviction, which the Catholic ecumenist may not set aside for an instant,

* The text of a paper read at the Unity Conference held at Graymoor, N. York, from May 3 to 5 of this year.

permit carrying on a dialogue, praying in common, or establishing a common end with those who belong to other Christian communities?

Not all Catholic ecumenists answer this question in the same way. Some believe that it is possible, and even indispensable to carry out all ecumenical work in full equality. It is true that the Catholic believes that his Church is the sole true Church of Christ. But he is not the only one who believes that he alone possesses the truth. For example, Father Couturier writes: « When realized in the soul of a believer, the Catholic faith becomes with respect to the content of his belief, a psychological reality which is similar to the psychological state created in the respective souls of his Protestant, Anglican, or Orthodox brethren by the psychological reality of their respective faiths. One therefore finds that *psychologically, Catholics, Protestants, or Orthodox find themselves situated, with regard to the problem of Christian Unity, in a similar position* » [1].

Quite rightly Fr. Villain gives the term « master idea » to this belief in the identical psychological situation of Christian consciences before the problem of unity [2]. It gives rise, in effect, to the assuming of further positions. For this reason we should listen, before proceeding further, to those who do not admit that this view is either right or useful.

Without any doubt they concede that carefulness in maintaining equality, at least as much as possible, will facilitate contacts with our non-Catholic brethren; and that this pleases them very much, indeed much more than the traditional appeal for a return to the Mother Church from which their ancestors once withdrew. It consequently behooves us to make compensation for that which is less accommodating in doctrine through an understanding of others, and through a redoubling of charity and humility. Moreover, we are dealing with ecumenism: our interlocutors are prepared to see us act and speak according to our own faith. Since it is said that they also think they possess the truth, they will permit us a stand which is likewise their own. Herein lies the big ecumenical difficulty. If it is inherent in the state of separation, it is the part of wisdom to recognize it, and thus make the effort to overcome it rather than to deny it and let it subsist.

Whatever the considerations of the practical order may be, the question remains whether or not all Christians, when they

---

[1] « Prière et Unité chretienne », cited by Fr. Maurice Villain in his *L'Abbé Couturier*, p. 357. Italicized as in the text.

[2] ibid., p. 52.

maintain their different confessions, are in the same psychological state. This must be emphatically denied. Doubtless, being in good faith they all believe that they possess the truth. Much more so, if they have the virtue of faith, as we are allowed to suppose, all that they see in the light of that faith is certainly true. But do they all see what they affirm? No, for by the light of faith one sees nothing false; and when two Christians are in opposition because of contradictory assertions, one of the two is in error. He is not conscious of it, but on this point he is not conscious either of seeing the truth; whereas, the one who sees rightly on this point, is conscious of seeing rightly. Fundamentally, we revert to the objection of the skeptics who allege the same psychological state for the one who thinks rightly and the one who is in error. The answer to them would be the same as the one we are giving here.

The one who is in error does not know that he is in error; but on the point upon which he is mistaken, he is not conscious of knowing the truth. If it were otherwise, no one would ever be sure of possessing the truth, and the ecumenical movement could not be justified; it could never come to its proper end. It could not be justified because, if each one had full assurance of possessing the truth, uneasiness and dissatisfaction, the causes of soul-searching, would not arise; and if the movement were to begin, it would never come to an end. In fact, anyone not satisfied with the certitude he had of the truth of his confession on a given point, would be doubtful of any similar certitude received in a contrary sense on the same point.

Let us take a concrete example. A Protestant affirms that the Catholic Church is in error, that in particular there is nothing which obliges him to believe in the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. First of all, if he saw this in the light of faith, he would have true certitude, which nothing could legitimately shake. If he were to change his opinion, and if, in dialogue with Catholics, he came to admit the truth of the Assumption of the Mother of God, and if this new certitude were in no way different from the former, what reason would he have for placing confidence in it? If such a change is to be a legitimate one, the first certitude must not have been one of faith, but rather the second.

In the case of the Catholic, all that he is bound to believe on the authority of the Church is seen by him in the light of faith. For the Christian who is not Catholic, there is always some point in that which he professes that he does not see in the light of faith, even if it should only be the error which he attributes to the Catholic Church. The certitude which he professes to have on this point is entirely different from that which he has on the great

mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption which a true faith manifests to him. St. Thomas declares that error cannot be believed by faith in these words: « Ratio formalis obiecti fidei est veritas prima; unde nihil potest cadere sub fide, nisi in quantum stat sub veritate prima, sub qua nullum falsum stare potest, sicut non ens sub ente, nec malum sub bonitate » (2-2ae, qu. Ia, art. 3c).

We will find the same divergencies among Catholic ecumenists if we pass to the consideration of the end of the Ecumenical Movement. Doubtless, everyone accepts it as a return to unity of faith, and this bears with it unity of government and of worship. Those who try to carry out ecumenical work on an equal footing with the other confessions may not present this return as a return to the Catholic Church; for this would give the Catholics too great a superiority. Let us even be willing to suppress this word « return ». It is not really necessary, although it is frequently found in the Roman documents, even in the encyclical « Ad Petri cathedram » and in a papal discourse delivered on April 24, 1960; and even though its ordinarily accepted meaning contains nothing offensive. Should we say accord or union with the Catholic Church, even this seems to signify some superiority. The difficulty, therefore, is to be resolved by a twofold operation.

On the one hand, the non-Catholics will be asked not to leave their confession, but to remain in it, to live it more deeply, to reform themselves, to revivify themselves. Who could refuse such a programme for unity's sake? On the other hand, the Catholics will be asked to do the same. Father Couturier formulated his concept thus: « Under the influence of prayer, each Christian group, including the Catholics, will deepen his life, will make use of his talents, will reform himself in whatever way he should be reformed, and will ascend toward the Lord until he reaches that height where the walls of separation come to an end. All, then, and reciprocally, recognizing in their other brethren the Christ whom they adore, will recognize Him as He is, identical with Himself, one, sole in His love, His life, and in His thought. Then will come the realization of dogmatic Unity, the full agreement of all spirits with the sole Thought of Christ. And union will proclaim itself through the voice of Peter. Perhaps this will be done in a great Ecumenical Council » [3]. His biographer tells us that he « preached nothing else than the attachment of each one to his own Church, and the programme of ' spiritual emulation ' to make

---

[3] Quoted by M. Villain, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-362.

progress toward the Unity willed by Christ » [4]. Since everyone should change, it is not a matter of promoting a union of the Protestant or Orthodox brethren with the Catholic Church as she is to-day. She will be transformed; all will be transformed. « A revivified Catholicism alone will afford conditions in which the non-Catholic Christians could integrate ... Thus, we respect the Mystery of a progression which will lead us from the impoverished Catholicism of our epoch, already undergoing a magnificent reawakening, toward the fulness of a renewed Catholicism in which all our brethren will find the fulness of their desires » [5].

It is upon this vision of unity, which will mean for no one either conversion, renouncement, or denial, but simply, and for all, the achievement of an internal progress, miraculously brought to its term: it is upon this vision, I say, that the formulas propagated by Father Couturier for the January ecumenical week were inspired. All Christians should say the same prayer for unity. The Catholics, then, would not ask for the entrance of their non-Catholic brethren into the Catholic Church because the others would be unable to say such a prayer. Since the time when convergence of all communions will bring about unity is unknown, and the form which will be conferred upon the Church by this convergence and miracle of union is also not known, one prays that God may realize unity when He wills and by the means that He wills.

The whole of this concept, quite coherent for anyone who admits its principle, pleases the non-Catholics, and also many Catholics who find it both liberal and generous. Its authors overflow with charity, zeal, piety, and enthusiasm. I should like, for my part, to retain as much as possible of it, but it cannot be denied that it also has its disadvantages, or lacunae, and I must now say a word about these.

First of all, it is true that the more the Catholic Church becomes perfect in its members, the more strongly will it attract the other Christians. This is why the Pope, now gloriously reigning, intends to prepare the way for the progress of unity by celebrating a Council which will cast greater splendor upon the titles of the Catholic Church. There are many things which are capable of modification. But these lie in the order of the accidental. The Council is not going to construct another Church. Particularly, the present doctrines will all still have to be firmly believed, and their meaning will remain unchanged. If today they are an insur-

---

[4] ibid., p. 185.
[5] ibid., p. 286.

mountable barrier, they will remain so tomorrow as well. One may therefore invite Protestants and Orthodox to come to the Roman Church even now, and strive to show them this permanent miracle, ever admired by tradition, of the duration and the activity of the Church.

It is also true that according to the measure of their sanctification, the non-Catholics become increasingly attached to the truths which they possess. But will they in like manner also renounce the errors which separate them from the Catholic Church? This would not follow necessarily. There are examples of non-Catholics of lofty Christian ideals who have died without becoming reconciled with the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, since it is supposed that the sanctification which is asked for them will lead them to the Catholic Church, the more loyal and honest thing would be to say it plainly. Otherwise, one would encourage them to dream of a Church to come, different from the Catholic Church of to-day, and this would hardly dispose them to overcome their separation for the sake of essential and permanent elements of our Church.

We are told that when all Christians ask for unity with one identical prayer, offered by all at the same time, unity will be accomplished by God. Granting that such unanimity were possible without still another great miracle, how do we know that it would have this efficacity? For this answer a revelation would be required. But above all, as long as the separations last and we understand unity differently, we cannot say the same prayer in asking for unity. Members of the direction of the Faith and Order Commission and other Protestants have understood this, and they have understood that it is only possible for us to pray at the same time. Dr. Oscar Cullmann, for instance, tells us: « Catholics themselves ought not to hide from the Protestants that they may not discuss unity with us with that absence of *a priori* which we may experience when we enter into ecumenical dialogue » [6].

Even so, I willingly recognize that the Catholic ecumenists of whom we speak let it be seen at times that they do have in mind the Catholic Church as the terminus of the Ecumenical Movement. Thus the convergence brought about by the different confessions, in the mind of the Abbé Couturier is indeed a convergence towards the Catholic Church, since the final union will be proclaimed by Peter, according to the text cited above. The fact of the matter is that, after all, in spite of the concessions made to egalitarian

---

[6] Oscar Cullmann, *Catholiques et Protestants*, Paris: Neufchâtel, 1958. p. 25

requirements, they are still guided by faith in the Catholic Church's prerogative.

Until now we have treated of a total concept of Catholic Ecumenism. The criticism accompanying our presentation has permitted a sufficient understanding of the position of another trend which seems to us to be more traditional, and to conform better to the Pontifical documents. However, we do not wish to define it by opposition alone to the preceding method because there are many points in which the two trends coincide.

First of all, our separated brethren ought to know the immutable truths of the Catholic Church referred to in the Instruction of the Holy Office, *Ecclesia catholica,* concerning the true nature of justification and « the constitution of the Church, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction, and the only real union effectuated by the return of the separated to the one true Church of Christ ». How are they to know this if we do not speak of it? In conversation once with one of the most outstanding theologians of the World Council, the latter told me that he thought that the Catholic Church would one day drop one or another of the defined dogmas. If our separated brethren should know the above-mentioned truths, with all the more reason should the Catholics to whom one speaks of Ecumenism know them.

With this established, one may very well, while showing towards all the most sincere charity, keep close to the historical truth on persons and deeds of the past as of the present, judge with kindness the writings of our separated brethren, enter into dialogues and conferences with complete objectivity, and still more seek in opposing doctrines the part which is true, throw it into relief and use it to show how it would be safeguarded and strengthened as part of Catholic doctrine. All this should be done without polemics, but with dignified and candid apologetics. In this way we will further that convergence of the confessions towards the Catholic Church which is desired by the ecumenists of whom we have spoken.

We may now consider a few particular questions on which there is a certain difference of opinion among Catholic ecumenists.

The great majority of non-Catholic Christians have preserved Baptism. They have the cult of the Holy Bible; they preach the Gospel; they recite beautiful prayers and sing moving hymns. These are gifts of God by which they receive graces, may live well, and attain their salvation. The Orthodox, who must always be considered apart, since they are the brethren closest to us, have preserved the Priesthood, and devotion to Mary and the Saints. Now, what relationship with the Roman Catholic Church results

from these gifts which are also known as « vestigia Ecclesiae »? Does it perhaps follow that the members of the dissident churches are also members of the Catholic Church, or also that these separated Churches are truly and properly Churches?

No Catholic ecumenist maintains that members of those bodies can be members of the Catholic Church in the same sense as Catholics, because in that case, all would be in the same Church, and union would be an accomplished fact. It is merely a question of saying that they are members in some way. One thing certain is that Baptism validly conferred of its nature introduces one into the true Church. There are some who quote this sentence from the Encyclical *Mediator Dei*: « By the waters of Baptism, as by common right, Christians are made members of the Mystical Body of Christ the Priest » (AAS, (1947) 555) and arrive at the conclusion that the separated brethren in good faith are members of the Mystical Body, although not in the full sense as are the Catholics. There are others, however, who are of the opinion that this encyclical refers to the natural effect of Baptism, an effect which can be suspended by some cause. They appeal to an earlier encyclical, the *Mystici Corporis,* where it is said: « Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority ». But our separated brethren do not profess the true faith. Moreover, the same encyclical, a little further on speaks of these brethren as they are today, as not belonging to the visible organism of the Body of Christ, and it describes their state in conformity with this fact. They have simply a relation of order to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer through a certain desire and a certain unconscious aspiration, and they are invited to enter the organism of the Body of Christ.

The teaching of this encyclical would therefore appear to be clear; and since it is directly applicable to the matter at hand, it should serve to interpret the other texts. Finally, in the encyclical *Humani Generis,* of still later date than the two others which we have just cited, Pius XII voices this complaint: « Some say they are not bound by the doctrine explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing » (AAS 1950). Nevertheless, it seems to us that the difference between the two opinions is not so great as it might appear at first sight. The bond of desire and of aspiration that the *Mystici Corporis* shows between the dissident Christians and the Mystical Body of

Christ, and which permits of eternal salvation while maintaining the validity of the axiom « extra Ecclesiam nulla salus », signifies perhaps everything that some others mean by the term « members, but not in the full sense ».

Still more serious is the question of deciding whether the separated communities possessing elements of the true Church are by that very fact, and in so far as they are communities, objects of divine favor, and are Churches in the proper sense. If such were the case, one would have a notion of the Church quite close to that which is most widespread in the World Council of Churches: the Church of Christ is not comprised within one sole Church, but is found in several which differ in faith. The famous branch theory was more moderate. There still remains a difficulty. How can it be that where there is true Baptism, perhaps other Sacraments, perhaps the Eucharist, where there is the service of Christ, there is no Church?

Indeed, the term Churches is given to the dissident Oriental communities. This is done in order to recognize in them their authentic apostolic succession, and consequently their real though incomplete hierarchy. Nevertheless the term is not applicable to them in the full sense, since as such they are dissident; and if they constituted a Church, there would be Churches outside the true Church of Christ.

I believe that the real answer is this: where there is Baptism, there is the Church; but it is the Roman Catholic Church. A text of St. Albert the Great found in the book *Divided Christendom* by Fr. Congar, O. P. reads thus: « The Sacraments are the nests of the Church; but these nests do not belong to the heretics: thus, when they lay down their little ones, they do not lay them down outside the Church, but within her » [7]. This is a doctrine that St. Augustine often inculcated against the Donatists: « Malum enim dissensionis, schismatis, haeresis, malum suum habent; vero quae in illis agnoscimus, non sunt sua: Domini nostri habent bona, Ecclesiae habent bona » [8].

The person who receives a valid Sacrament outside the Church enters into possession of a good of the Catholic Church; he has not the right to it, but his good faith saves him. Of course, it is within his own confession that he receives this benefit, but it is not by the merit of his confession.

---

[7] III *Sent.*, d. 6 C. a. II, ad I: Congar, p. 288.

[8] *Sermo ad Caesareensis Ecclesiae plebem*, n. 2 M. 43, 691. « The evil of dissension, of schism, and of heresy which they have is their own evil. The good things, however, which we acknowledge in them are not theirs: they have the good things that belong to our Lord and to the Church ».

The grace of God falls, therefore, directly upon the individual persons when it is given outside the Catholic Church, and not primarily upon their « Church ». Nevertheless, one could think that in certain circumstances, and for a greater good, God favors the interests, for example of Protestantism, not insomuch as it is opposed to the Catholic Church, but in so far as it has conserved the elements of the Church mentioned above. What God wills, then, is that His gifts succeed in reaching the men who have been redeemed by Jesus Christ. What He permits is that they reach them even illegitimately. That which traditional doctrine forbids is extending the Church of Christ, which is His Mystical Body, beyond the Roman Catholic Church. One must also keep in mind that if some Christian elements, such as the frequent reading of the text of the Bible, have been more intensely cultivated within some dissident communities than in the Catholic Church, this particular care which exceeds that of many Catholics, does not exceed the desire of the Church, and this situation could continue within her fold without effecting in her any change of a substantial sort.

Catholic ecumenists hold different opinions on another point. The first act which will be proposed by the Assembly of the World Council of Churches at New Delhi will be, according to all indications, the proclamation of the integration of the International Missionary Council with the Geneva Council. The Orthodox members of the World Council resisted until 1959. Since then they have allowed themselves to be persuaded to give their approbation. Many Catholics declare that they are not happy about this integration. One easily understands that the directors of the World Council of Churches would have desired this act, and would have guided their member Churches accordingly. Missionary effort is inherent in the nature of the Church; the Council will help the Churches to fulfill this essential function. The Council has become an institution which still maintains a certain movement toward unity, but which conducts itself rather like a federation of Churches. I heard the reasons designed to make this integration agreeable to the Orthodox and the Catholics expressed by Norman M. Goodall, ex-president of the International Missionary Council and President of the Committee for Integration, as well as from M. Max Thurian who functions at Geneva. The former was firmly convinced, the latter somewhat less. Firstly, integration will not mean very much of a change, since already almost all the Churches belonging to the International Missionary Council belong also to the World Council, which consequently aided them in their mission. Then, integration is desired for

reasons of faith and of organisation, and not at all to make obstacles for the Catholic Church. Finally, integration will introduce the ecumenical spirit everywhere; it will combat bad proselytizing, and it will hinder the sects which are at the present time the most dynamic in attempting to invade the Catholic countries. All this, along with other considerations patiently collected by Fr. Bernard Leeming in his excellent volume *The Churches and the Church* (pp. 185-207) tends to allay our fears, and permits one to wait and see the consequences before forming a conclusive judgment. Nevertheless, I am unable to understand how the aid furnished by the World Council to the Protestant Missions could fail to abet the progress of Protestantism, the enlargement of divisions, and the forming of a still greater obstacle to the Catholic missions. I believe that it would have been wiser, from the ecumenical point of view, to have sought unity first, and with unity to have gained the world for Christ: « Even as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me » (John, 17, 21).

I think I have touched upon the principal questions confronting the Catholic ecumenist, and upon which they have at times taken different positions. Since these differences exist, it is better to consider them. It is perhaps the best way of attenuating them. It is also a way of making progress. An opinion which springs from sorrow for divisions and love of unity, will always contain some valuable element of truth which the man who thinks otherwise is glad to assimilate. Truth is a fundamental good: it does not divide, it unites. It is the bread of the intelligence, but one must often earn it by the sweat of his brow.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

POPE JOHN XXIII AND THE CHRISTIAN EAST

II. Services in Turkey and Greece

In the early part of January 1935, Monsignor Roncalli took leave of Bulgaria where he had spent ten years in an intense and varied apostolate. On Friday, the fourth of January, he alighted without fanfare at the station of Istanbul. He was dressed in civilian clothes, for the Turkish law, which was ultra-laical, forbade the wearing in public of any « confessional » garb whatsoever. The very mention itself of his new office would be enough to reveal all of its complexity: Apostolic Delegate in Turkey and in Greece, and administrator of the Apostolic Vicariate of Constantinople.

One need not be very competent in Church history to know that Asia Minor and Constantinople, from the time of St. Paul to that of St. John Chrysostom, and from the era of St. Theodore the Studite to that of Constantine, recall a Christian past of great prestige. The schism between East and West hypothecated this wealth, which later Islam was to disperse. In the land of the first eight Ecumenical Councils, Christianity practically vegetated under the Ottoman domination until the day in which the new Turkey reduced the extant Christian groups to a pitiful and precarious minority — a plurality of Churches, alas!

In 1935 out of the 18,000,000 which made up the Turkish population there were but 200,000 Orthodox and a few thousand Gregorians or Armenian Monophysites. On the morrow of the migrations which resulted in the wake of the first World War, the Catholic Church, as did also the separated Eastern Christians, concentrated its efforts towards conserving something of the terrain so painfully acquired; and in this the religious communities of the Assumption played a leading role.

From his residence situated in the Pancaldi quarter, His Excellency Msgr. Roncalli embraced under his pastoral care a complicated framework of ecclesiastical circumscriptions in European and Asian Turkey: an apostolic exarchate for Catholics of the Byzantine Rite, an archbishopric for the Armenian faithful, several dioceses for Catholics of Chaldean and Syrian Rite, etc.

As Vicar Apostolic of Constantinople, the future Pope was primarily obliged to administer to the community of Latin Rite, composed of 49 churches, 65 priests, and approximately 10,000 Catholics. It was a disparate and hybrid flock, numerically quite restricted; and thus it was indeed a *pusillus grex,* a « little flock ».

But the merits of a pastor are not measured by the number of those under his care. There was, besides, good reason for Monsignor Roncalli to spend himself in their service, and in this he was the servant of all: Latins, Greeks, and Armenians. He knew how to conduct himself over and above ethnic or ritual susceptibilities and, without placing undue stress on the tragic, was able to handle well the thorny issues of parrochialism, revealing himself as the father of all in the true sense of the word.

It was with paternal affection that the new Apostolic Administrator greeted the Catholics of Constantinople in French on the 6th of January, 1935. « Would I be able not to love you, » he said, addressing himself to his new spiritual family, « and not place myself completely at the service of your souls; and wherever there is need of it, to sacrifice myself for them? ».

On the preceding day he had called upon the *vali* (governor) of the city and upon the prefect. By a kind of miracle, which was to repeat itself in the years ahead, he immediately gained the sympathy and the esteem of those personages who were little disposed to religion and thus more hostile to the Church. Little could resist his genial countenance and his frank cordiality. The Turkish newspapers did not hesitate to bring this to light as soon as Pope John XXIII's election became known. They recalled the friendship that existed between Monsignor Roncalli and Mr. Menemendjoglou, the general secretary of the Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the « lively admiration » which the representative of the Pope had evoked at Ataturk. The newspapers of Istanbul also emphasized that the Apostolic Delegate always and everywhere revealed himself as a true friend of the Turkish people. It was he, moreover, who for the first time permitted a number of prayers to be recited in Turkish in the churches of the city, and he himself had his first pastoral letter redacted in that language. Upon the death of Kemal Ataturk in 1938, he expressed the desire of seeing Catholics sharing in the nation's mourning.

Thus, without any outward display, by the sheer irradiation of his charity, Monsignor Roncalli was able to create a climate of understanding and of reciprocal confidence between Catholics and the Turkish authorities. The latter who had been so diffident up until a short time before, finally were willing to recognize

that Turkey would never have to rue the loyalty of its Catholic subjects, and even less that of the representative of Rome, a true religious leader aloof from political entanglements, who on every occasion was capable of being a Turk with the Turks, an Armenian with the Armenians, a Greek with the Greeks, an Italian or a Frenchman with the Latins — and a Catholic at all times and in every circumstance.

At Istanbul Monsignor Roncalli necessarily found himself in contact with both clergy and laymen of the separated Eastern Churches. As in Bulgaria, this spectacle of the Schism afflicted him deeply. But what could be done to remedy the situation? As he did in the past, so now the Apostolic Delegate would simply resort to his favorite arms: prayer, patience, comprehension, tactfulness, and an exquisite charity. It is indeed quite an accomplishment to bring about a state of distension, a climate of confidence between brothers who for a long time reciprocated invectives and turned their backs on one another. And in this Monsignor Roncalli succeeded.

In 1939, after the death of Pope Pius XI, a delegation represented the Orthodox Patriarch Benjamin and another the « Gregorian » (dissident Armenian) Patriarch at the memorial service, even though it was celebrated in the Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Spirit at Constantinople, in suffrage for the venerable deceased. In order to bring more into relief the ecumenical character of this ceremony, « His Excellency desired that the other ministers be of Eastern Rite, to render visible, in the variety of language and rite, the unity of the whole Catholic Church about its Head. Thus, each one played his individual part in the ceremony: the Melkite Patriarchal Vicar, Monsignor Scismi, in Arabic; Monsignor Nicholas in Bulgarian; and the Greek and Armenian Bishops in their own language and rite. Finally, the absolution in Latin was imparted by the celebrant himself. The impression on those attending was striking » [1].

In the discourse which he pronounced on that occasion Msgr. Roncalli laid emphasis on the efforts of Pius XI in favor of Christian unity. « This », he said, « is a new title of merit and of honor for the late Holy Father. It is quite evident to you, my brethren — and above all here in the East we sense its bitter taste — how the flock of Christ is dispersed and divided. Out of the depths of twenty centuries, the aspiration of Christ still makes itself present to us: 'And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear

[1] L. Algisi, *Giovanni XXIII*: Torino, 1959, p. 129.

my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd' (John 10, 16).

« These words which John the Evangelist has trasmitted to us were the most intimate longing of the heart of the Holy Father, Pius XI. The limits imposed upon me by the present circumstances counsel me not to raise up before you the precious veil, an embroidered pattern of papal fatherliness, reflecting an ensemble of providential acts, of exquisite sollicitude, of respectful and generous interventions with which the late Pontiff pursued this which has always been the great and loving care of the successors of St. Peter for the reconstitution of the unity of the Christian family. Time veils and unveils all things. One day — perhaps still very distant — the vision of Christ, the *one fold and the one shepherd,* will be the grand reality of heaven and earth. In that day the singular merits of our lamented Holy Father will be resplendent with evidence, and the souls who will contemplate that spectacle will be amazed. May, then — and this I entreat of you in his name — the effort to grow in the spirit of fraternal love be unanimous: and let us continue to repeat the common profession of faith: *In one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church* » [2].

After the solemn pontifical Mass, the Delegation presented their condolences to the Apostolic Delegate. The following May 27, the latter himself called at the Phanar to thank the Patriarch Benjamin for participating in the mourning of the Catholic Church. This exchange of courtesy was more than a pure and simple act of protocol. As an act of unprecedented courtesy, it marked a decided change in the relations between Rome and the center of Orthodoxy; and to this Monsignor Roncalli had contributed a great deal.

During this same period the Titular Archbishop of Mesembria served also in the capacity of Apostolic Delegate to Greece. From time to time he visited groups of Catholics in Athens and while there he took up his residence at *hodos Sina;* later his quarters were transferred to *hodos Omerou.*

This delegation had been in existence for a century, and its history had been characterized by tormenting episodes, due primarily to the vexations of the government and of the Orthodox leaders who were fiercely hostile to Catholic « proselytism ». In fact, if there exists a nation where the love of country and fedelity to Orthodoxy are profoundly blended, it is certainly Greece, the

---

[2] *L'Osservatore Romano,* February 21, 1959. Cited in an article on the late Pius XI.

bastion of Photian Hellenism. There a Roman Catholic is easily accounted as a betrayer of his country. Thus it is that these « betrayers » are not at all numerous: several tens of thousands as compared to 7,000,000 Orthodox. Dispersed at Athens, in Pyrrho, and above all in the islands, these Catholics (often of Venetian and western origin) belong in general to the Latin rite. Catholicism would be much more easily tolerated if it were only occidental. But it also takes in Eastern rites. Against these « tactics » the Orthodox Church has always reacted strongly, above all in Greece where the situation became very tense after an apostolic exarchate had been set up in Athens itself for Catholics of the Byzantine rite, i. e., for those Greeks who were refugees from Asia Minor and Constantinople following the disaster of Smyrna (1921).

At the most, these numbered some two thousand Catholics; but in the eyes of the Orthodox, they were considered as being too many. In 1938 the government minister Metaxas published a royal decree greatly limiting the exercise of Catholic worship and of episcopal administration. The Apostolic Delegate, who was opportunely present in Greece at the time, proposed that the Catholic bishops take steps to present to the head of the Government a number of propositions calculated to amend this crippling law. There was no need for Catholics to consent to being muzzled; they must react with vigor. Thus, the following year the edict was softened on several points. The intervention of Monsignor Roncalli had not been in vain.

The sojourns of the Apostolic Delegate in Athens did not consist solely or essentially in official appearances or in visits of courtesy to the different Greek authorities. They were truly pastoral visitations. Surprisingly, there was not even a small automobile at the disposition of the representative of the Pope! But, on the other hand, such a vehicle would have been useless for traveling over the mule trails of the Cyclades or for conveniently traversing the fourteen tortuous bends that lead from the port of Santorino to the terraces of the city. Msgr. A. Vuccino, A. A., who received his episcopal consecration from the hands of the Apostolic Delegate and who was a witness of his pastoral visits, has described for us how Monsignor Roncalli would travel across the islands in the bright sun and would visit the smallest Catholic communities, all of them so happy and proud to receive this Roman prelate who was simplicity and goodness personified.

As a humanist admirer of the classics and a profound connoisseur of the Christian antiquities, Monsignor Roncalli rarely failed, in passing, to make a tour of the different ruins, to contemplate the beauty of the locality, and to rediscover there the

traces of a St. John or of a St. Paul. With the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles in hand, he took delight in meditating on the spot the luminous teachings of the founder of the communities of Corinth and of Thessalonica. The monastic republic of Mount Athos likewise received a visit from him; and its monks, so set against anything that smacked of Rome, were filled with wonderment at seeing a « popish » delegate admiring their cloisters, the mosaics of their churches, and venerating in Eastern fashion their Byzantine icons.

The appearance of the Italian troops in Greece seemed to the Apostolic Delegate an unexpected means for the promotion of unity. In fact, on the 29th of June, 1942, he was to write from Athens: « Among the activities undertaken during these war years, there is one which will be regarded with real satisfaction by whoever is frankly conscious of his Italian character; and it is this: that of all the fatiguing and costly forms employed by the Holy See in these latter times with a view to preparing the so-called union of the Churches, which is simply the return of all to Catholic unity, no one of them has shown itself to be so efficacious on the spirit of the Greek people as the behavior of the Italian forces of occupation, which have been here for over a year. Assisted as well by a facile contact with the others ... who also occupy this unhappy nation, they have been able to create such a new atmosphere of respect and even of sympathy for Italy, for the *gens italica,* and for the religion of Rome, that it has the appearance of something prodigious. How much of this phenomenon will remain after the war is difficult to foresee, and it would be well not to entertain any excessive illusions. However, today it remains a fact; and it is a surprising moral victory which compensates by far for the disappointment of the first months of the Greco-Albanian war. What a happy manifestation this is ...! Thus, I should like to be the historian and the illustrator of this spiritual transformation which ought to give greater scope to the irradiation of that *Romanitas* which does not absorb nationalities but elevates them to an equal participation in the riches of Christ » [3].

The war situation of 1940 was particularly fraught with serious consequences for the people of Greece. A state of famine arose almost immediately; and in fact, in the sixteen months of Italo-German occupation, almost 300,000 persons died of starvation or in consequence of the maladies caused by malnutrition.

---

[3] Algisi, *op. cit.,* p. 319.

It was at this time that the Holy See commissioned Monsignor Roncalli to repair in person to the various localities in order to coordinate the work of assistance. At Athens the Apostolic Delegate made contact with the forces of occupation and the Greek authorities; and to these he set forth his program in favor of the needy, insisting on the fact that his charitable activities were being carried out over and above every consideration. Through his instrumentality a number of Catholic initiatives developed rapidly: commissaries, living quarters, distribution of « papal spaghetti », clinics. Flour was made to come from Hungary and medicines from the Principality of Monaco. The Monsignor spent himself unceasingly in the service of the famished and ailing people of Greece. In addition to material help, he was constant in proffering moral assistance, particularly among the Greek, Italian, and English prisoners in the concentration camps, in the hospitals, and in other military centers. He even succeeded in sharing the food of the soldiers on the other side of the barbed wire enclosures. In time he likewise set up an information center which concerned itself primarily with prisoners of war. People still recall with gratitude that he did not hesitate to intervene with the authorities of the Vatican, travelling to Rome expressly for the purpose, in order to request Pope Pius XII's intervention with the Allied forces so that the blockade against Greece might be mitigated. It is also known that Von Papen came to see him in the hope that through his influence the Holy See might obtain from the Americans and British an honorable armistice for the Axis.

It was through this supernatural and truly disinterested charity that Monsignor Roncalli, in tragic circumstances, succeeded in some way in gaining the sympathy of the higher Greek clergy, so hostile against any sign of gratitude on the part of the Greek Government towards an official representative of the Vatican at Athens. Msgr. Damaskinos, the Metropolitan of the Capital, was himself won over by so much goodness.

In November 1945, at ceremonies commemorating Greek resistance in the face of the Fascist invasion, a Catholic bishop was permitted to take his place in the tribune of honor side by side with an Orthodox archbishop. Such a thing would have been inconceivable in Greece in the years preceding the war. Another prejudice had fallen: one could be an excellent Catholic and at the same time a Greek patriot. To this « miracle » Msgr. Roncalli had contributed a great deal. Thus at the moment of his election as Supreme Pontiff, the Greek press was to show itself enthu-

siastic in saluting John XXIII as an outstanding benefactor of the people of Greece.

More than once the present Holy Father has expressed his sense of nostalgia with respect to these ten years spent in Turkey and Greece. To his successor, Monsignor Testa, he confided: « I was happy to be in Turkey. Down there I was not simply a diplomat. I was able to mingle with all sorts of people, interesting myself in their difficulties, and coming to their aid. In Turkey I spent some of the most wonderful years of my life ».

On April 26, 1959, when Pope John XXIII had occasion to receive a large group of athletes, he alluded to the approaching Olympic Games (Rome, 1960), and evoked the marvels of his sojourn in Greece and his visits to the ruins of Olympia.

A few weeks later he received the Greek King and Queen in an official visit. On that ocasion the Holy Father, most affably, emphasized all that the name « Greece » contained of richness, of prestige, and of delight.

« We do not know », he said, « how to express the joy which We experienced as We landed on the shores of your dear country, full of these classic and Christian memories; contemplating with Our own eyes the Acropolis, the Parthenon, the Theater of Epidaurus, and so many other venerable vestiges of antiquity; following the footsteps of the great St. Paul at Philippi, at Salonica, at Corinth, and on the Isle of Crete ...

« At the end of Our sojourn a veil of sadness was drawn over these glories and these consoling memorials of the past; the scourge of war had enveloped your unfortunate fatherland into an infernal tomb. At the same time it was for Us a deep consolation to be, for many of the unfortunate, the canal of the inexhaustible charity of Our predecessor, Pope Pius XII, whose magnanimous heart was so keenly sensitive to all calamities ».

On June 11, 1959, the Pope received in official visit the president of the Republic of Turkey, Mr. Celâl Bayar.

Received according to the usual solemn protocol, the chief of state was met by the Holy Father on the threshold of the throne room. After the conversation in private and the presentation of the retinue, Pope John XXIII greeted him amiably in French, recalling his residence of ten years in Turkey and the visit of the President's predecessor to Pope Pius XII. He likewise recalled a number of incidents that occurred during the years of his acquaintanceship with the Turkish president that began in 1935, and said that he was happy to assure him of the «loyalty of the Catholic minority upon whom religious convictions impose the duty of professing, before the legitimate powers, the most respectful def-

erence ». « And our children », continued the Pope, « who for a long time now have consecrated themselves in Turkey to the tasks of education and of social welfare, in the schools, in the hospitals ... have at heart their service for the genuine good of the population and are honored to do their share for the life and prosperity of the nation ».

Although physically distant, Turkey always remained close to the heart of the Pope, who added: « It is likewise for Us a motive of true and lasting satisfaction to have introduced into the Church, and adding it to the Latin — a sign of the understanding of changing times — the reading of the Gospel in the Turkish language, at that time in its new form and placed again in the universal concert of human exchange. It is through such means — without excluding others equally felicitous and efficacious — that the meeting and understanding of men with men are realized, as well as nation with nation and people with people. It is in this way that mutual comprehension grows, together with the joy of human and pacific fraternity under the gaze of Almighty God, Who considers all men on earth as the children of His love. Through the vicissitudes of life and of history, men and peoples rejoice to find themselves such as the Creator made them in their diversity, in order to lead them towards the victories of peace and of true civilization ».

At the end of his allocution, the Pope said: « In order to crown the joy that your honorable visit has procured Us and to rekindle once more the precious memories of Our long sojourn on the flowery banks of the Bosporus and in the highlands of Anatolia, permit Us to say in your mother tongue the invocations which We learned and had the Christians of Turkey recite: May the good God be praised! Blessed be His holy name! ». And after having repeated these invocations in Turkish, His Holiness continued in French, and then again in Turkish: « We pray God to protect the people of Turkey, and we implore wholeheartedly upon them and upon their rulers the abundance of divine blessings ».

This was a further occasion for the Pope, now vested in pontifical robes, to link with the past and to prolong that beneficent and pacific activity which he had at one time carried out as Apostolic Delegate to Turkey and to Greece. The ecumenical importance of that experience is considerable. In the heart and mind of Pope John XXIII, as yesterday in that of Cardinal Roncalli, the Christian East holds a most important place.

(*to be concluded*)

DANIEL STIERNON, A. A.

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

VIII. The Emperor, John VIII Palaeologus

John Palaeologus was born on 16 December 1392, the eldest of the six children of Manuel Palaeologus and Helen, his wife, into a world of great difficulty, for Constantinople was in the beginnings of its death throes. When John was but seven years old, his father on his way to Europe to seek the aid of the western princes, took him with his mother and his brother Theodore to Monembasia where he remained with his uncle Theodore for some years till the threat to Constantinople was lifted.

The city he returned to was « enclosed within a stout and lofty wall, defended by many strong, high towers ... Though the circuit of its walls is thus very great and the area spacious, the city is not throughout very densely populated. There are within its compass many hills and valleys where corn-fields and orchards are found and among the orchard lands there are hamlets and suburbs which are all included within the city limits. Everywhere throughout the city there are many great palaces, churches and monasteries, but most of them are now in ruins » [1].

What the effect of these shattered glories of the past had on John's character may perhaps be gauged from a remark of his father recorded by Sphrantzes: « My son, the Emperor, seems to himself to be a suitable emperor — but not for the present day. For he has large views and ideas and such as the times demanded in the heyday of the prosperity of his ancestors. But now-a-days, as things are going with us, our empire needs, not an emperor, but an administrator. I am afraid that the decline of this house may come from his poems and arguments, for I have noted his propensities and what he thought to achieve with the Mustafa, and I have seen also the results of his doctrines, in what danger they have brought us » [2]. The reference to John's « poems and arguments » suggests that he had received a careful literary education. He certainly quoted a line of Homer correctly in Ferrara

---

[1] Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406*, ed. Guy Le Strange (London 1928) p. 87.

[2] Sphrantzes ed. J. B. Papadopoulos Chronicon (Leipsiae 1935).

and took with him to Italy a copy of the works of St. Basil: Traversari declared in a letter of 11 March 1438: *Vidimus apud imperatorem pleraque graeca volumina digna memoriae.* Other indications on this point are few, though a suggestion is to be found in Ducas, who recounts that the son of Bayazid, a hostage in Constantinople, « was enamoured of Greek learning while with John, the Emperor's son, and frequenting the school set his mind to letters and was taught »; and an anonymous panegyrist makes John out to have been a prodigy of learning, educated in the military arts of riding and shooting with various weapons, in military strategy and naval tactics, in literature, rhetoric, theology and philosophy, « consorting daily with Aristotle and Plato ».

As the territory of the empire round Constantinople became more and more restricted by Turkish conquests, Manuel envisaged the plan of strengthening his hold on and enlarging his possessions in the Peloponnesus. He himself spent some three years in Greece (1413-16) and in autumn 1416 he sent John there, who with his brother Theodore, took by conquest a large portion of Messenia and Elis from Centurione, prince of Achaia. While he was away his young wife Anne, a Russian princess whom he had married in 1414, died of the plague. John returned to Constantinople in 1418 and with the necessary dispensation from the Pope, on 19 January 1421, married Sophia daughter of the Marquis of Monferrato, a Latin princess. A mistaken policy in regard to the Turkish succession on the death of Mahomet I (1421) led to a short attack on Constantinople and John, who had on 19 January 1421 been associated as co-basileus by his father, set off for Hungary on 15 November 1423 to seek the aid of Sigismund, and returned in the October of the following year.

Manuel died on 21 July 1425, dividing the Byzantine possessions between his sons and leaving Constantinople to John. A little more than a year later (August 1426) John's wife, Sophia, fled from his capital and, after the necessary divorce, John married his third wife, Maria Comnene, daughter of Alexius king of Trebizond, in September 1427. A month later he was on his way to the Peloponnesus where war had broken out between the Greeks of Mistra and Carolo Tocco prince of the port of Clarentza and of most of Elis, who was defeated disastrously. The result was a new Greek principality under Constantine, John's brother. An attack on Patras, a papal possession, failed, and in October 1428 John returned to his capital. The next major event in his life was the Council of Florence. Negotiations had been initiated by John's father and he continued them, first with Martin V, then with Eugenius IV and the Council of Basel. The result was his

departure with the Patriarch Joseph II and some 700 clerics and courtiers in November 1437 for Italy where he assisted at the Council in Ferrara and Florence, at which agreement on union was reached. He arrived at Constantinople on his return on 1 February 1440 some six weeks after his wife's death. The union agreed to in Florence was not well received in Constantinople and the last years of John's life, marked also by an insurrection organized by his brother Demetrius and other family frictions, were spent trying to implement the agreement and to reconcile unionists and non-unionists. He died on 31 October 1448 and was refused the usual church rites by the ecclesiastical authorities [3].

This very brief biographical sketch gives some idea of the variety of external activity in which John Palaeologus engaged. The documents on which it is founded deal naturally with his public actions. To get behind them to his private life and to estimate his character, one has to take a hint here and a suggestion there and, piecing these together and fitting them into the general background of his official life, to form a general picture of the man.

By the time that John Palaeologus entered upon the Byzantine scene the imperial family was living in reduced circumstances. His father several times had to appeal to the West for financial as well as military aid. In the negotiations with Martin V about union Manuel had to lay all the expense of a possible council on the papal shoulders. John himself on his journey to Sigismund of Hungary (1423) raised money in Venice by pledging certain articles. The imperial palace, as it was in the year 1435, is thus described by Pero Tafur: « The Emperor's palace must have been very magnificent but now it is in such a state that both it and the city show well the evils which the people have suffered and still endure ... Inside, the house is badly kept, except certain parts where the Emperor, the Empress and attendants live, although cramped for space » [4]. Perhaps because of this relative poverty the family life of the Palaeologi was the closer and the more intimate. John had a great respect for his parents. Manuel, when dying, had recommended to his special care Sphrantzes the chronicler, and for this reason the new emperor long refused both his brother

---

[3] Scholarius, *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, ed. Petit, Siderides, Jugie (Paris 1930) III p. 100. Scholarius wrote: « He lost both his kingdom and his life in that simulation of Latinism and was justly deprived of the honours of the Church whose well-being he had neglected ». Can it mean merely that he was not allowed to don the monastic habit before he died?

[4] Pero Tafur, *Travels and Adventures 1435-1439* ed. Malcom Lewis (London 1926) p. 145.

Constantine's and Sphrantzes' appeal that the latter be allowed to accompany the despot to the Peloponnesus, declaring that to let Sphrantzes leave himself would be against his father's behest. He yielded finally, but only when the Queen-Mother had been persuaded to second the request. His mother's influence with him was always high. He consulted her about negotiations for ecclesiastical union: he wanted her advice before the election of a new patriarch to succeed Joseph II who had died in Florence: no one else dared break the news of his wife's death to him on his return to Constantinople in 1440.

His own married life produced no children, though he was married three times. Anna, his first wife, was only 11 at the time of her marriage and she died three years later (1417). His second wife, Sophia Malatesta, though beautiful of body, was so ugly of face that John took an aversion to her and left her isolated and lonely in some distant apartments of the palace. Indeed he would have shipped her off back to Italy, had not his respect for his father stopped him. Sophia herself ended the impossible situation by fleeing to Italy in August 1426 — and John did not try to stop her. Bessarion was commissioned to find his third wife and he arranged a marriage with Maria Comnene, daughter of Alexius of Trebizond, a girl of ravishing beauty who won John's heart. When she died in his absence, not even his brother had the courage to tell him but left it to his mother, and John's grief was such that Syropoulus accounts it as one of the reasons that favoured the anti-unionists after Florence, because the Emperor was too stricken to take any action.

His relations with his brothers, of whom he had five, were rendered difficult by the dispositions of his father's will and the question of succession to the imperial throne after his own death. He himself was set on having Constantine follow him in the capital city, though there were two other brothers older. He seems to have handled the delicate situation adroitly enough, however. When Theodore, the next eldest after himself, declared his intention of becoming a monk, John brought Constantine from the scattered Greek possessions round the Black Sea to the Peloponnesus and, when Theodore changed his mind, retained his favourite brother in that centre of Greek influence by giving him the territory newly acquired by the war of 1426-28. Constantine went to Constantinople in September 1435, to be followed a few months later by Theodore come to protect his rights. John then arranged that Theodore remain in Constantinople, which he was nominated to rule in John's projected absence, while Constantine and Thomas were to share the Peloponnesus between them. The result was war

in the Peloponnesus stirred up by Theodore against his brothers, a war that was settled by John's envoys so that Constantine should reside in Constantinople and Theodore share with Thomas the Greek possession of the Peloponnesus. So Constantine returned to the capital and took over the government while John was absent in Italy. But the process was reversed in 1443, and only the death of Theodore a few months before that of John himself secured the throne finally for Constantine.

As a soldier John seems to have been very competent. The two campaigns he engaged in in the Peloponnesus were eminently successful and even if he failed to take Patras at the first attempt (all three brothers John, Theodore and Constantine were engaged in it, but not very seriously) the city was forced to pay a yearly tribute to Constantine. These two wars indicate that John was following up his father's policy of building up Byzantine strength in Greece. The plan was wise, but also it needed delicate execution, so as neither to irritate the Turk too much and force him to reprisals nor to embitter relations with Venice. It proved sufficiently successful to let the Greek kingdom of the Morea survive the fall of Constantinople for seven years.

If he followed his father's policy faithfully as regards the Peloponnesus, he departed from it disastrously on one occasion, with regard to the Turk, while Manuel was still living, acquiescing though not approving. It was when, on the death of Mahomet I, he thought that by supporting the claims of Mustafa, the dead man's uncle, against those of his son Murad, he could help the fortunes of his country. In the ensuing conflict Mustafa was defeated and killed, and Constantinople suffered the siege of the summer of 1422 in consequence. It was John's first and last attempt of the kind. Thereafter he tried to preserve good relations with his Turkish enemies; in 1437 he even advised the Emir of his proposed departure for Italy, though he did not take his advice to forego the enterprise and be content with Turkish friendship. That attempt to restore union between East and West, which besides its ecclesiastical aspect was also a political move to bring the western Powers to the aid of the dying empire, was also against the mind of the cunning Manuel, whose policy had been ever to keep the prospect dangling before the eyes of the Latins but never to put it into execution. That it failed in both its aims was neither John's fault nor the Pope's but was due partly to the opposition engendered in Constantinople by Mark Eugenicus and a few others, partly to the disastrous defeat of the Christians at Varna (1444) and to the growing nationalism and divisions obtaining in Europe. Here again the event seems to prove that Manuel had the wiser

political head, but had Varna been a victory instead of a defeat (the Christian crusade had won a resounding victory shortly before) Constantinople would have survived for many long years at least, and John's policy been vindicated.

In spite of the poverty of his circumstances the Emperor did not abate anything of the pomp and ceremony surrounding the imperial throne. Tafur, after describing the limitations of the royal palace proceeds: « The Emperor's state is as splendid as ever, for nothing is omitted from the ancient ceremonies, but, properly regarded, he is like a bishop without a See. When he rides abroad, all the imperial rites are strictly observed ». There are plenty of examples to illustrate John's insistence on the honours due to him. In his correspondence over union (and in his addresses to his prelates in Ferrara and Florence) he frequently asserted that it was he, as emperor, who had summoned the Council. On his arrival at Venice the Doge invited him to land by the Venetian state-barge: John insisted that his own galley be towed to the quay that he might step ashore from that. In the preparation of the church for the first public session (9 April 1438) at Ferrara, there was altercation about the position of his throne relative to that of the Pope. Then he wanted to proceed on horseback right to his throne (the sessions were now being held in the palace of the Pope) and when that was not possible a way had to be broken through the wall so that he could be carried to it without setting foot on the ground and unseen — meanwhile the sessions were suspended. This Byzantine ceremonial was misunderstood by a good man of Peretola who was honoured by the Emperor's resting and dining in his house on 27 July 1438, when on an outing with some 50 of an escort of gentlemen and attendants to visit Pistoia and the Girdle of Our Lady at Prato. In his account of the incident he wrote: « And because he had lost the use of his legs he entered right into our room on horseback, without being seen by anyone to dismount, unless by his gentlemen and attendants ». In December 1438 there was the episode of the Burgundian envoys to the Council who brought letters to the Pope and addressed to him their speeches, ignoring the Emperor. John was not content till the « insult » had been repaired in a special session by the presentation to him of a fictitious letter. This same determination to be given the respect he considered due to him raised a difficulty in the framing of the Decree of Union. The earlier draft had mentioned only the Pope's name in the opening phrase. The Emperor protested that both his and the Patriarch's should be added, and he had his way.

John's insistence on punctilio may seem exaggerated, but it was not pointless. Besides its being the traditional etiquette that surrounded the Byzantine throne, it served to create in the Latin mind an impression of the dignity, majesty and importance of his empire — an empire it would be worth while to preserve against the depredations of the Turk. As he said to the Patriarch about the appearance of the clerics: « If it (i. e. the Church) makes a dignified showing there, it will be honoured by them and be a credit to us. But if it is seen to be shabby, it will be despised and counted for nothing by them ». John himself had a special bed and carriage prepared for his sojourn in Italy. Besides, John and the Greeks came to Italy, not as suppliants or inferiors, but as equals, and that was why there was so much argument about the positions, heights and ornaments of the thrones for the public sessions — a question, that is, not only of dignity but of principle, and the Emperor's insistence (like that of the Latins) was for the defence of the principles involved.

But John was not always on his dignity. He was passionately fond of riding and hunting and was generous in inviting others, and among them young men, to share his pleasure.

Once established in Ferrara and having little to occupy himself with owing to the decision to allow time for the arrival of the envoys of the western princes, John took up again his favourite pastime, and from his residence outside the city of Ferrara, where the plague was raging, occupied his time in hunting. To such a degree did he indulge in the sport that Syropoulus complains bitterly of his neglect of his duties and of his lack of care for his ecclesiastical subjects languishing in the city, and reports that on two occasions the Marquis of Ferrara made strong representations to the Emperor, begging him to restrain his enthusiasm for the chase because of the damage he was causing to the property of the contryfolk and of the decimation of the game that the Marquis had imported for his own pleasure — but without avail [5]. He continued with his hunting even when the public sessions had begun [6]. He was usually followed about by a favourite dog [7] and took back with him a number of hounds from Italy to Constantinople [8], using them for a hunt on the way at Kotzinon [9]. Arrived back in Constantinople and learning of the death of his wife, John went into mourning. But as soon as he roused himself from his

5 Syropoulus, *op. cit.* VI 2 p. 143, VII 4 p. 191.
6 Ibid. VI 20 p. 173.
7 Ibid. IX 10 p. 265.
8 Ibid. XI 9 p. 325, XI 10 p. 328.
9 Ibid. XI 9 p. 326.

grief to tackle the problems of union, he went back again to his hunting [10].

Syropoulus, from whom most of the references in the preceding section have been taken, reports the hunting episodes always so as to portray the Emperor as selfishly indulging his own pleasure and neglecting the due care of his subjects. But even from Syropoulus' biased portrait of the Emperor it emerges that John was not all etiquette and hunting. One of Syropoulus' reasons for lamenting that the Emperor resided outside of Ferrara during the summer months of 1438 when the plague was raging in the city was that there he was inaccessible. His very complaint emphasises a fact, shown abundantly elsewhere, that the Emperor was approachable, not only by his higher courtiers, but also by lower ecclesiastics. And they availed themselves of that condescension freely, going of themselves or as the mouthpieces of the Patriarch or of the ecclesiastical section of the Greek contingent at the Council. On many occasions the Emperor summoned meetings to discuss the situation, sometimes in his own residence, more often in the apartments of the Patriarch, and there he invited opinions, advised, persuaded, encouraged, and occasionally lost his imperial temper and rounded upon individuals, even such venerable figures as Antony of Heraclea, the oldest of the Greek prelates, but slow of mind, poorly educated and not a little obstinate. On the journey from Ferrara to Florence he took with him the oldest of the prelates, including Heraclea and Mark of Ephesus, so as to spare them as much as possible the fatigue of the journey. Yet Ephesus was the most obstinate opponent and obstacle to his hopes and the only Greek prelate in Florence who did not sign the Decree of Union. Even so the Emperor always treated him with the greatest consideration and courtesy, refused to fall in with the Pope's twice expressed wish that Ephesus should be called to account for refusing to submit to an oecumenical Council and, at Ephesus' request (for he feared, he said, for his own safety), took him back to Venice and thence to Constantinople in his own immediate entourage.

Throughout all the period of the Council, the Emperor, for all his hunting, did not enjoy good health. He was ill at Venice when the decision Ferrara-Basel was to be made; ill at Ferrara when the question of discussion of the *Filioque* was to be settled and at times away from the public sessions for reasons of health. One of the few kindly things that Syropoulus says of him is apropos of a Greek conference of 29 April 1439: « He was so ill

[10] Ibid. XII 6 p. 338.

that he could not lift his head from his pillow, and he who was always ill and always insisting that he was well, then could only say: ' I am ill and I don't know if I can manage to express what I want to say ' ». One thing at least that he suffered from was rheumatism.

As regards the Emperor's attitude to religion, Scholarius, writing in 1451 or 1452, asserted that « he always hated the impious and persecuted impiety and was full of zeal to confirm and augment the faith of Christ by teaching and in other ways ».

Scholarius, however, immediately goes on to say: « But for one thing alone could he be censured, namely this ecclesiastical confusion, and this he shared in involuntarily; voluntarily he stood apart from it. Under some pressure to dissimulate, all the same he showed what he really was by deeds and evident signs both to God and to the right-minded, and he, practically alone, was the cause for us of retrieving that defeat » [11]. If that statement of Scholarius is completely accurate, then John was guilty of a certain amount of double-dealing, in that his insistence on implementing the union arrived at in Florence was, after his return home, due more to policy than conviction, or at least to a mistaken point of honour — having given his royal pledge, he would abide by it. There are other phrases that hint the same thing. « These (scil. our reasons) we often took to the late most excellent Emperor, and we well know he thought about what he had done and how he was satisfied with our answers and praised those who acted thus and abominated those otherwise disposed. Of this we are all witnesses, each and all having heard it from his own words and lips. But he, filled with a groundless dread about his kingdom and lest to the Latins he might seem dishonourable if the evil promises were not kept, hazarding, alas!, the salvation of his soul, would not bring himself to effect the cure of his soul openly and to save those who meanwhile were being destroyed by the dissimulation of the Emperor ... He gave us leave to meet frequently in the Xylalas palace and to make our defence for our pertinacity, in the presence of the legate, even though he was bringing great pressure to bear on behalf of union ... but, not willing to help the Church in any other way, he gave up both his kingdom and his life in that simulation of Latinism and was rightly deprived of the honours of the Church whose well-being he had neglected » [12]. Mark of Ephesus gives a possible indication of the same, though not so clearly. Referring to certain monks'

---

11 SCHOLARIUS, *op. cit.*

12 Ibid. III p. 99-10.

insubordination to a unionist superior appointed by the Emperor he writes: « And when the Emperor learnt of it he said nothing but confessed openly that he regretted the action and laid the blame on those who had submitted and signed ».

In view of the above statements it is necessary to examine John's whole attitude towards union. That help for Constantinople was one of the motives, or at least one of the inducements, for holding a council whose fruit, it was hoped, would be the reuniting of the Church was not disguised from the beginning. The popes proclaimed it: the Council of Basel referred to it: the Emperor spoke of it both at Constantinople before his departure for Italy and occasionally in his addresses at Ferrara and Florence. It was taken for granted by all parties. But that does not necessarily mean that it was either the sole or even the chief motive for bringing about union. It was also a common conviction, shared in by all parties, that disunion was regrettable and wrong, and all sincerely desired to put an end to it. The difficulty was how to do that in such a way as to render the results effective and permanent. Attempts had been made before and failed. The only way that could recommend itself to the Greeks was an oecumenical council and, if at all possible, with the presence of the pope. Both John and the Patriarch insisted on these conditions time and again, and also that discussion should be free and untrammelled and both sides loyally accept whatsoever the Holy Spirit should inspire the Council to decide.

As regards the oecumenicity of the Council the Greek demand was satisfied — the Greeks were present with Emperor and Patriarch, with most of their bishops, with representatives of the other eastern Patriarchates and of many of the eastern Churches: the Latins were fully represented with the Pope. Mark of Ephesus admitted as much when addressing the Pope in the Emperor's name on the question of voting in the Council: Scholarius in his written *votum* of 30 May 1439 declared the same: the Emperor several times asserted it, most solemnly in his *votum* of the same day when also he proclaimed it his duty to uphold each and every decision of such an oecumenical Council.

But on the other hand it has been, and is, frequently said that in the Council there was no real freedom of speech and that the final Decree of Union was the result of Latin and royal pressure. Whether this charge, as levelled against the Latins, is or is not true, does not concern us here, but we must examine shortly the accusation against the Emperor.

At various times John VIII enunciated, according to Syropoulus, certain principles that should govern the whole discussion.

Firstly, sincerity; replying to Mark Eugenicus who had asked whether in the conferences on Purgatory the Greeks should speak with real contention and insistence or rather ' with economy ', the Emperor replied: « Declare with real contention all our rights ». Secondly, till the Synod had settled the issue, they should preserve an open mind on both the Greek and the Latin doctrines. Thirdly, the opinion of the majority should prevail, both in the Council as a whole and in the private conferences of the Greeks, after which there should be no cavilling.

He defined his own office as follows: « I am the defender of the Church. This function of defender ... in the present matter seems to me to have a double aspect — the one to preserve and defend the dogmas of the Church and to furnish liberty to those who wish to speak on their behalf so that they may bring forward without hindrance whatever sound doctrine they like to pronounce, and to restrain and rebuke those who assail it in a contentious and hostile spirit: the other to hold together and preserve ours in concord, that all may agree in one decision and opinion » [13]. These principles explain all of John's conduct at Ferrara and Florence.

There is no question but that John took his position of ' convener of the Council ' seriously. He, not the Patriarch, was the head of the Greeks in Italy. He normally consulted with the Patriarch and often with all the Greek prelates on what was best to be done in the practical field, but no step was taken without his consent, a fact which the Latins too recognised for they addressed their requests, their demands and their grievances to him. This is so obviously true that there is no need to support the statement by quotations: both the *Acta* and Syropoulus' *Memoirs* furnish innumerable instances of it. All the same, he never ventured into theology — that was the province of the Church. He might, and did, appoint the exponents of the Greek doctrine and even approve or reject or combine various of their explanations (as e. g. in the discussion on Purgatory), but, as he twice told the Pope, he would not act tyrannically to his synod. If the Greeks elected among themselves speakers or a committee, the choice needed the Emperor's approval. For that reason it is all the more noteworthy that for most of the public sessions in Ferrara and for all those in Florence the spokesman of the Greeks was Mark of Ephesus, the only Greek prelate who was consistently opposed to the Latins, though there were others who competently

---

[13] Syropoulus, *Memoirs*, ed. by R. Creyghton as *Vera historia unionis non verae* (Hagae-comitis 1660) VIII 5 pp. 221-2.

have exposed Greek theology — Bessarion, Georgius Scholarius, Isidore of Kiev or Gregory Mammas, all of whom in the event advocated union and so would have better suited the Emperor's supposed purpose of uniting the Churches by hook or by crook. The fact should not be overlooked, for it shows clearly that at least till 21 March 1439 the Emperor allowed freedom of speech.

There followed months of negotiations and expedients. Finally for the Greeks the question resolved itself into harmonising the teaching of the Greek and the Latin Fathers. It was at this point that the Emperor introduced the system of having the opinion of each one recorded by the secretary — first of all on the question of the genuinity of the Latin Fathers, then on whether the *Filioque* was to be accepted or not as true doctrine. His purpose was clear. It was to make the vacillating come to a decision, which as it would be preserved in writing they could not easily go back on, and to discover the majority opinion of the Greek community. Probably there were a few among them who would have preferred to give no positive decision at all, because they had no definite opinion on the question but only a vague sentiment that the Latins were wrong and the Greeks right. But there is no sign anywhere that any voter was constrained one way or the other. Syropoulus complains that the archontes (laymen) registered their votes (one such has been preserved, of Boulotes), whereas the Staurophoroi, officials of the Great Church and deacons, were not asked. If that is true, it is strange. But it is almost equally strange that it seems to have made no impression of injustice on any one else: at least there is no reference to it in any of the later polemics against union where it would have been a useful proof of the iniquity of Florence. In any case, both the *Acta* and Syropoulus are agreed that of the prelates by far the majority — 15 against 5 and later increased to 18 « Ayes » — voted for the *Filioque* and union, as did at least two out of the three lay-theologians, Scholarius and Amiroutzes. On the principles that he laid down for himself, the Emperor was justified in holding that the Greeks, on the chief question that divided East from West, the question that had occupied all the public sessions of the Council, were agreed to unite with the Latins. When it came to the signing of the Decree, only Stauropolis (who had secretly left Florence) and Ephesus did not append their names, and the Emperor did not constrain Ephesus to sign nor did he enforce any sanction against him for his contumacy in resisting what was generally regarded as an oecumenical definition, or allow others to do so.

What John's attitude to this union achieved was after his return to Constantinople is harder to define. Almost all the litera-

ture that we have, that recounts the sequel in Constantinople, comes from the pens of the antiunionists, and we have seen what one of them insinuates. When the Emperor saw the tragic fruits of his attempt to bring harmony into the Church — that the old division remained and was now more than ever embittered — he may well have regretted that he had ever embarked on the project of union at all and in the practical field have decided that forcible repression of the opponents of Florence would not succeed. But there is no fact that can be pointed to that would support the idea that he too had in his inmost heart repented of his adherence to the Decree. His delay in taking practical steps to implement the union is explained, and satisfactorily explained, by Syropoulus as due first to his mourning at his wife's death, and then to the attack on his city by his brother. The incident that the *Apologia* of the anti-unionists adduces as an example of his favourable attitude towards them — the discussion in the Xylalas palace — is hardly convincing, because such discussions would have depended also on the good will, and possibly even on the initiative, of the Latin legate.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that both the patriarchs elected during John's lifetime were unionists, and that Scholarius, a great favourite and friend of his, suffered his displeasure for a time for his anti-unionist proclivities. Then, too, the majority of the Emperor's counsellors and of the court was unionist — even the Grand Duke Lucas Notaras whom Scholarius tried to won to orthodoxy with frequent letters, even he was ' unsound ' as late as 1451-52 — which was the reason why Scholarius so often lamented that they put their trust, even for the safety of Constantinople, in the wrong place, in western aid instead of in fidelity to the true faith. And the fact remains that, notwithstanding his knowledge of the fate meted out by the Orthodox Church after his death to the unionist Michael VIII, the Emperor John VIII died loyal to the union he had subscribed to in Florence. In Florence, referring to his own Greek bishops, he had said: « I am not master of the Synod and I will not unite ours by tyrannical action ». After his return to Constantinople he remained, it would seem, of the same opinion. He would persuade, but not force; and his anti-unionist subjects, who had expected more obvious and tangible signs of the royal displeasure, interpreted such tolerance as weakness and as evidence of the bad conscience of their sovereign.

But if John on the one hand failed to satisfy the hopes of his anti-unionist subjects, on the other he disappointed also the popes — in this again like his predecessor on the path of union,

Michael VIII. Nicolas V in 1451 wrote of him to Constantine, then Emperor of Constantinople: « For we have not the least doubt that John Palaeologus, your brother and predecessor on the throne, in virtue of the prudence with which God had endowed him, could, had he so wished, have brought this business to a happy conclusion: but, because he was too intent on adjusting it to his temporal situation, he was taken from your midst » [14].

* * *

« In the year 1448, the 12th indiction, on 12 March, the Emperor Kyr Constantine left the Peloponnesus and took possession of Constantinople after the death of our ever-venerable and thrice-blessed, mighty and holy, master and emperor Kyr John of the noble house of the Palaeologoi. When he paid the debt it was during the year 1448, the 12th indiction, on 31 November (*lege*: October), Thursday, at the 10th hour of the day, and he was buried in the venerable monastery of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ the Pantocrator, in the tomb of his wife. May God lay his soul with the holy emperors. Amen. Amen. Amen.

He who wrote this is Demetrius Lascaris Leontaris » [15].

Joseph Gill, S. J.

---

[14] *Epistolae pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum spectantes* ed. G. Hofmann (Romae 1940-6) doc. 304.

[15] S. Lambros, *Palaiologeia kai Peloponnesiaka* IV (Athens 1930) pp. 90-1.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Unity Conference of the Friars of the Atonement

An imposing Conference on the theme « Approaches to Christian Unity » was held at Graymoor, Mother House of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement from May 3 to 5. About 120 Catholic ecclesiastics — comprised of noteworthy theologians, editors, and promoters in the field — made up the gathering. A special session was also held for seminarians, the unity apostles of the future. Three authorities on ecumenism had come from the Old World: Msgr. J. G. M. Willebrands, Secretary of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Rev. Charles Boyer, S. J., President of the Unitas Association, and Rev. Bernard Leeming, S. J., of Oxford.

The kindlier attitude toward the brethren to be united prevailed in this event which Rev. John B. Sheerin, of the Paulist Fathers, described as « a triumphant step forward », and with which « the Catholic ecumenical movement in the United States has now turned off the side road into the main highway ».

Indeed, the event would have rejoiced the heart of Father Paul Wattson, that great pioneer of Christian Unity, whose outlook upon the separated Churches had been « ecumenical » before the present world-wide movement was born.

The high point of these momentous days was marked by the presentation of the « Father Paul of Graymoor Award », a handsome silver plaque, by Fr. Angelus Delahunt, Father General of the Friars of the Atonement, to Fr. Charles Boyer, in acknowl edgment of his outstanding accomplishments in the furthering of Christian Unity.

In view of the superabundance of material to be reported upon, an account will necessarily be shaped according to the discretion of the writer. Had this report been compiled by another, the points selected would have been different. Those considered in this article have been selected with the interest of *Unitas* readers in mind. More satisfactory coverage will be found in the selected texts of the papers read which will soon be printed in book form.

The studies were opened with a paper read by Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S. A., entitled « The Theological Foundation of the Chair

of Unity Octave ». He discussed the problem of prayer intentions from the point of view of their conformity with Catholic belief. Since the act of prayer is an act of an intellectual being, it is proper that the one praying should know and declare the object of his petition. The petition of prayer and the confession of belief are closely allied: « Lex supplicandi lex credendi ». In the case of a Catholic, prayers for unity imply a particular Christology and ecclesiology. Both the Catholic and the non-Catholic must form their petition according to their consciences, but if the faith of the latter differs from that of the former, the petitions will necessarily differ. If the non-Catholic is seeking the One Holy Church of God as something not yet discovered or existing, he must formulate his petition accordingly; whereas, the Catholic will formulate his in a mode which will indicate his desire for the reconciliation of dissident Christians with a Church which by virtue of divine power does exist, and which he desires to share with these others.

Fr. Hanahoe discussed the underlying spirit of charity in Papal documents referring to the separated brethren, and cited their reiteration of terms used by Christ, such as « one fold and one shepherd »; significant in our day is Pope John XXIII's appeal for a return to the « House of their Father », and « not to a stranger's house, but to their own home ».

Fr. Bede MacEachen followed the theological paper on the Octave with an historical account of it. He spoke of its foundation by Fr. Paul in 1908 and cited the approval of this Octave, along with a decree for the usage of the prayer in connection with it, « That they all may be one ... », by Benedict XV in 1916; the approval by succeeding Pontiffs, and their commendation of the Atonement Friars' promotion of it.

Rev. Paul Mailleux, S. J., Director of the Russian Center, Fordham University, at New York, gave a conference entitled « Eastern Churches and the Primacy: Some Considerations ». He derived evidence from an analysis of Orthodox theological writings that Orthodox thought and sentiment has been modified and has undergone a favorable progression. The negation of the Primacy of the Pope has become less determined, and theologians permit themselves less unfavorable opinions. A will to understanding has become more pronounced in this period of the exiles.

Fr. Mailleux offered a suggestion on the practical level: Catholic authorities would do well to provide theology courses for Orthodox Seminarians so as to impede dissolution of traditional theological learning in the dissident Eastern Churches.

Father Boyer was given the occasion to prove his renown as a Roman theologian and ecumenical authority. He found himself face to face with an exceptionally trying task, since in accepting the subject requested of him by the Atonement Friars, « Trends in Catholic Ecumenism », he had not only assumed the responsibility of finding theological solutions to problems still under debate, but was obliged as well to pass judgment on varying points of view involving his own and others' ecumenical principles and practice. He proceeded to develop his thought with his usual intellectual serenity, failing in courtesy to none, nor failing either in profound reverence for truth. He pierced through the complexities of each problem to its simple core, and delivered his findings with clarity, and fine accuracy of expression.

He analyzed the trend conceived by the Abbé Couturier in his desire to facilitate friendly relations between Catholics and their separated brethren. Adherents of the many Churches and confessions, including the Catholics, would deal with one another on a plane of parity, since all are in good faith, and are equally convinced of their own truth. Through progressive sanctification — since sanctification supposes closeness to Christ — the various groups, each retaining its confessional loyalties, would approach Christ, and the thoughts of Christ. In so doing, they would approach one another. Unity would be attained through convergence. This procedure is eminently positive, obliging no one to deny his own position.

Objectively, it was recalled, this parity does not exist. The essential truths of the Catholics are necessarily true, while one or more beliefs of the non-Catholics must be erroneous. Subjectively, the non-Catholics may also be sincerely convinced of their truth, but the element of error contained in their belief is unconfirmed by the light of faith. The possibility of confessional change and modification resides precisely in this psychological difference. Without it no further advance toward unity would be feasible.

The noted ecumenist pointed out that although modifications of an accidental sort may occur in the practice and manifestations of the Catholic Faith, the essential truths will remain forever unchanged. Some of these are unacceptable to non-Catholics now; they will be no less unconformable to the differing confessions at a later time. Moreover, the mind of the Church as expressed in the *Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement*, issued in 1949, requires that the true and entire Catholic doctrine be presented to the separated brethren at the present stage of their quest for unity. But, Fr. Boyer affirmed, whatever the superiority of his Church, the individual Catholic in dialogue can never be

too humble; he should compensate for his interlocutor's disadvantage with redoubled patience, kindness, and understanding.

In discussing variations in Catholic opinion on the problem of the Church and the Churches, he said that there are separated Christian communities to which the term *Church* may correctly be applied in acknowledgment of their Apostolic Succession, but when so used it is not given the full sense. Otherwise, there would be not one, but many churches. Grace is given directly to individual souls in separated Christian communions, but it is not received by merit of their Church. In the case of the Sacraments, they are properly goods of the Catholic Church. God permits that they be conferred validly although illicitly for the sake of the salvation of souls.

Through Baptism all souls become members of the Catholic Church. As for those not now in communion with the Catholic Church, some Catholic ecumenists would have them members « not in the full sense ». Fr. Boyer, following the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* would give them a relationship of order to the Church. The divergence between the opinions is slight.

Fr. Gustave Weigel, S. J., an ecumenical pioneer in the New World spoke dynamically on the theme « Ecclesiology and Reunion ». He found that ecclesiology, as distinguished from the tract *De Ecclesia,* is the fruit of ecumenism in our age, and this under the influence of modern Scriptural and liturgical studies.

He made the observation that from the practical point of view the purpose of the ecumenical movement is not so much to weld a union of churches as it is to unite the churches as closely as possible at a given moment. Only God has the power to make one of the many now associated in friendship, and from the manifold phenomena contrive the unity willed by Christ.

The current ecumenical interest has contributed something new to both the Catholic and non-Catholic Christian world. The Protestants have profited by a new appreciation of tradition; an ecumenical Church becomes clearer to them as something visible. At the same time, Catholics by responding in friendly fashion to the Protestant movement for unity, have come to appreciate the Church more highly not only as a custodian of doctrine, but, also in her invisible aspect of mystery and life. In these things there is a kind of convergence.

Fr. Weigel averted to the current problem before the ecclesiologist: What are the non-Catholic Churches? Our thinking, he says, may not depart from the axiom « extra ecclesiam nulla salus ». They are not churches, yet somehow they are; they are so analogically, he said.

Interrogated at the end of his paper on the problem of membership, Fr. Weigel concluded, after a display of agile reasoning, that baptized non-Catholics have *radical* membership in the Church.

Although Msgr. Willebrands spoke quite unofficially, the first appearance before an American audience of the Secretary of the Secretariat for Christian Unity was awaited with keen interest. His talk on the theme: « Ecumenism as an Experience and Theological Attitude » gave occasion for a description of the Church as the *oikumene,* the people of God, whose fulness is Christ.

With careful, scholarly method he fashioned an exposition of doctrine on the Church derived from both Old and New Testaments, that was as attractive as it was sound. Fr. Weigel had pointed out that Catholic theologians, under the influence of the ecumenical spirit, were pursuing a renewed awareness of the Church as mystery and life. The glorious image of the *Sponsa Christi* evoked by this veteran of countless friendly encounters with his separated brethren illustrated the new trend. « The Church is the New Israel », he says, « who sings the songs of the Kings and Prophets; she sings them in a new way because their meaning has been revealed and fulfilled in Christ ... The Church is the New Israel », he said, « who sings the songs of Israel, because He was given to her as her Head. He is her fulness, she is His Body, full of Him who fulfills all in all ». To this same fulness we owe the motive of ecumenical activity: « Catholic Ecumenism finds its origin or starting point in its divinely bestowed fulness of unity and catholicity. In the present world situation, the Church is confronted by the tremendous problem of divided Christians. It is a problem which is directed immediately to the Church's Catholicity ». The Church's passage through time, « between Alpha and Omega » is a life that is enriched and deepened under the influence of the Holy Ghost through the experience of succeeding generations. The *Instructio* of the Holy Office permits us to suppose that the Holy Ghost is acting upon non-Catholic souls, urging them toward unity, They are entering into more familiar association with us, and we with them. Is not the Holy Spirit, who is ever at work, ever benefitting Christ's Mystical Body, the Church, not thus preparing the members of His Body for a greater participation in the fulness of His life?

Msgr. Willebrands exposition could be effective in despelling some Protestant misconceptions of the Church. She is not monolithic or totalitarian: « As a unity in a diversity, or in a plurality, she is the contrary of a monolith, and she is world-embracing, or ecumenical. She is catholic because she contains the principle which is the perfection of every creature, the Alpha and the

Omega, Jesus Christ, who was sent by the Father ». The fulness of His love comprises all His divine attributes, and the power by which He perfects the world ... In Him all that is in earth and in Heaven is reconciled and brought into unity. The Church, which is the Body of Christ, receives incessantly from Him the fulness that He receives from the Father. This fulness reveals itself in her concrete form in all her parts. Just as a body has an organic structure, so has the Church's structure its hierarchically ordered parts. But everything finds its consistency in Christ.

This hierarchical structure is the first way in which unity manifests itself in diversity in the unity of all its members. The gathering together of all things in Christ does not signify totalitarianism because the Church respects and maintains the integrity of all that is proper to human values and legitimate human institutions.

Through its missionary activity, the Church becomes numerically increased. But just as the local churches contribute the fruits of their experiences to the glory of the whole Church, so will the newly created native hierarchies prepare the ground for new contributions on the part of local churches in the future.

In answer to a question from the floor, Msgr. Willebrands reconciled conversion work with ecumenical activity. The two methods favor one another. The truths learned through ecumenical dialogue may become for individuals the occasion for receiving the light of the Catholic faith. Such converts may, as has been verified in fact, draw after them successively other converts, or more or less large groups of converts from among their former fellows. Individual conversions alone do not give promise of achieving the unity of all within One Fold to which we aspire.

The speaker observed that ecumenical activity should rightly include the Jews because of the faith of the Old Testament held in common with the Christians.

Rev. Bernard Leeming, S. J., impressively learned, and widely experienced in Protestant and Anglican thought and activities, gave an invaluable talk on « The Present Direction of the Non-catholic Ecumenical Movement ». Helpful indeed to the Catholic was his explanation of characteristics of Protestant religious mentality. God is to be experienced immediately, in a non-conceptual mode; and the individual must be permitted to express in all freedom his concept of the intellectual content of the experience, granted, of course, the control of the Biblical text. Hence a typical vagueness of concept. Sentiment and emotion are less divorced from theological thought. Coupled with religious faith is a strong

sense of loyalty to the great Reformers, although it is not quite clear to what beliefs they are consequently committed. The Catholic's habit of an objective criterion is foreign to his habits of thought. It follows that Protestants are more affected by signs of good will and kindness than are Catholics: they are more prone to interpret the expression of theological differences as signs of ill will.

Fr. Leeming stated an opinion gathered from his own experience: « I do not think that the root difference between Catholicism and Protestantism concerns the way in which man attains to God and expresses his relationship with God; nor what man can do without God; nor is it what God does when he ' justifies ' man. Rather, it is *what men can, under God, do for one another.* Rejection of the Sacrifice of the Mass, of various sacraments, and doctrines, of the whole *corporate* system of Catholicism flows from this fundamental conviction ... I do not think that the difference between Luther and Catholics about the Sacrifice of the Mass turned on any abstract questions or assumptions ... I think it turned on the question *whether a Mass could do good to others than those present at it* ». The question is then concentrated upon Christ's salvation: in what sense is it meant to be « individual », and in what sense « corporate » or « collective ».

Rev. Walter M. Abbot, S. J., associate director of the review *America,* speaking on « The Scriptures and Reunion », explained the great benefit of Scripture studies to the ecumenical cause. In particular, he noted, recent critical studies have made the figure of the Church in the New Testament more apparent to Protestant scholars.

Rev. Shawn Sheehan's conference entitled « Liturgy and Reunion » emphasized the unifying power of liturgical worship, wherein the faithful pray to the Father, not only *through,* but also *with* Christ.

Of practical value in implementing the promotion of Christian Unity were papers on « The Information Center » by Very Rev. Msgr. Charles J. McManus, Director of St. Patrick's Information Center, New York; on « Journalism » by Rev. John B. Sheerin, C. S. P., editor of the review *The Catholic World*; and on « Radio and Television » by Rev. Sebastian Miklas, O. F. M. Cap., of Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

The seminarians present at the Graymoor Conference responded energetically, and with almost unsettling enthusiasm to the informal talks of Msgr. Willebrands, Fr. Boyer, and the affable Fr. Leeming in a special session. They wished to know what they could do for the cause of unity, and in response were given the sobering counsel that they could do nothing better than to

know their own philosophy and theology thoroughly well. As Fr. Boyer observed: « When one knows his Scholastic Philosophy, he is in a position to judge more accurately any other system he might study ».

SALVATOR BUTLER, S. A.

* * *

A DEBATE ON CHRISTIAN UNITY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS

A long session on Christian unity recently took place in the House of Lords, and it seems certain that it could not have happened in any other Parliament.

This was the last time that Dr. Fisher was in attendance as Lord Archbishop; from now on he will be simply a noble Lord. On this occasion, the Earl of Arran, with the intention of giving rise to a debate, proposed the following motion: « That this House welcomes the recent consultation between leaders of the Christian Churches and trusts that this will lead to a greater unity of Christian spirit ». The noble Lords accepted to speak on this motion, with a good number of them taking part in the debate — and some even at considerable length.

The sole member of this distinguished assembly who spoke against the motion and expressed disapproval over the Archbishop's journey was the Viscount Alexander of Hillsborough. All the other speakers judged the Primate of England's undertaking favorably. The author of the motion rejoiced at the Archbishop's « triumphant journeyings » of last autumn. The Earl of Longford, a Catholic, was particularly enthusiastic in applauding the visit to the Pope as « a most magnificent gesture of friendship », such as to perpetuate the Primate's memory even if his life had not been « one of many varied distinctions » [1]. The Lord Bishop of Chelmsford happily placed the trip within the genuine context of the ecumenical movement. In short, the gratitude expressed by the Archbishop at the end of the debate was well justified [2].

The member who took exception, Lord Alexander, a Baptist, spoke rather brusquely. The fact is that he wishes to acknowledge only the 39 Articles, the Prayer Book, and the sole authority of the Bible. He prefers that the Church of England be Protestant and to remain such. The Archbishop replies that on his part he

---

[1] Official Report, 10 May 1961, p. 266.

[2] Ibid., p. 322.

wants to be a Protestant, but, at the same time, he likes to be a Catholic as well. It is precisely there that all the drama of Anglicanism lies. Lord Alexander fears that the Catholic idea leads to Rome and declares with a sense of bitterness: « For no one can deny, in doctrine and in practice, a steady drift to Rome ... in this country during the last four or five decades » [3].

All told, nineteen speakers out of twenty approved of the Archbishop's undertaking.

The debate, however, went far beyond the particular case which had given the occasion for it. It was really a debate on Christian unity, as the title of the Official Report bears out. The question was not certainly whether it was necessary to desire it but simply how it had to be conceived, and by what means was its progress to be assured.

Some of the speakers were scarcely exigent. The author of the motion himself spoke only of the unity of spirit conceived by him as being much more extensive than unity of faith. Differences of doctrine did not seem to him of great importance. Every denomination worships the same God, is a member of the Church of Christ, and works for the coming of God's Kingdom. Let them join together, then, in an open and official affirmation of this unity of belief and purpose! And let them hasten to do so! [4]. Another is of the opinion that the Church of Christ should manifest herself on earth in different forms, in accordance, he says, with a greater urgency of presenting a common front to atheism [5].

Others were more seriously concerned with the truth. The Lord Bishop of Southwell vigorously emphasized the fact that the Scriptures say nothing about « the Churches » or « denominations » in the plural, but just of « the Church » in the singular. Division, he said, is an inheritance of history; it is our duty to work in order to obliterate it by mutual forgiveness and charity. His conclusion was the following: « I would venture to say that what is most necessary now is that the lay members of the Churches should feel acutely that our present divisions are not merely wasteful and frustrating, but morally wrong — a scandal to our conscience and a reproach to our Christian profession » [6].

Several speakers placed emphasis upon the change that has come about in our day in the relations between Christians of

---

[3] Official Report, p. 246.
[4] Ibid., p. 234.
[5] Ibid., p. 301.
[6] Ibid., p. 238.

different confessions. An atmosphere of respectful fraternity has been established, and this is already a good thing. Others, however, found it insufficient [7].

The Catholic Church was often brought into the discussion. It is noteworthy that the Pope's person, who was called the Holy Father or His Holiness, was referred to with respect, and often with admiration. Lord Ferrier declared that if the Archbishop had been bold, the Pope had been even bolder [8]. The setting up of the Secretariat for Christian unity came in for a good deal of praise. As far as the Church herself was concerned, her position with respect to the question of unity was well understood. In this connection Lord Milverton declared quite appropriately: « For the Roman Catholic Church unity is not a goal, it is a magnificent reality, and unity is to be restored by re-union and re-integration of other Churches in this existing unity » [9].

But it is just this position repugnant to liberalism, coloured by skepticism, and so frequent in our day which did not fail to appear in several speeches heard in the House of Lords.

Some Catholic voices were also heard. The Earl of Longford spoke of a revival of religious spirit, especially in the universities, denying in this way an affirmation of Lord Norwich: « The majority of people in England », said the noble Lord, « think that there are only two religions, the Roman Catholic religion, which is wrong, and the rest, which do not count » [10]. He recalled that the Catholic Church contains many more members than all the other Christian Churches put together. He also quoted the president of the French Protestant Federation, M. Boegner, who affirmed quite clearly that for Catholics, Christian unity cannot become a reality except within the Catholic Church. The Earl bore testimony to the desire of the Church for Christian unity.

But misunderstandings must be avoided. « On the whole », the Earl of Longford continued, « what has been found in my Church is that the best way to allow people to pray together is to encourage them to pray together in silence according to their consciences ». He explained how Catholics, far from closing Heaven to other Christians, look upon them as brethren; for, in accordance with a passage of St. Augustine cited by Pope John XXIII, they also recite the « Our Father ».

---

[7] Ibid., p. 296.
[8] Ibid., p. 252.
[9] Ibid., p. 311.
[10] Official Report, p. 264.

The Marquess of Lothian spoke likewise, noting that the will for unity is now present and that it is growing.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, speaking at the end of the debate, expressed his confidence in the progress of unity. There are still, doubtless, barriers, but they can be bridged. This is the hope he more recently reiterated in speaking about the Roman Church: Doubtless, he said, time will bring the Church of England closer to that of Rome. While not being able to say so officially, declared Dr. Fisher, the fact remains that in the conversations that Anglicans have had with Catholics in Great Britain, and in those which the latter have had with Reformed groups on the Continent, evidence points to the eventual dissipation of differences.

The House of Lords distinguished itself greatly indeed in holding with dignity such a memorable debate.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Delegation from the Pope Visits Ecumenical Patriarch at Istanbul

On June 20, a delegation of prominent Catholic ecclesiastics representing Pope John XXIII visited the Phanar to call upon His Beatitude Athenagoras, Patriarch of Constantinople. The group was made up of His Excellency, Msgr. Giacomo Testa, president of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical Academy in Rome; Monsignor Francis Lardone, the Internuncio to Turkey; and Father Alphonsus Raes, S. J., president of the Pontifical Oriental Institute at Rome.

In the course of their reception, Msgr. Testa declared that at Rome the manifestation of sympathy expressed on different occasions by the Patriarch towards the Pope had been gratefully appreciated. His Beatitude Athenagoras showed his good pleasure at this acknowledgment, and bade welcome to the delegation coming to him from Rome. He also deigned to congratulate each of the members of the mission with whose activities he was already acquainted.

As a token of appreciation, Msgr. Testa made a presentation to the Patriarch of the first volume of the series of books published by the Preparatory Commission for the Second Vatican Council, containing the text of the discourses in which the Pope has spoken of the forthcoming council. This served as an occasion for explaining the different phases of the preparation for the council to the Ecumenical Patriarch, who in turn praised the methods that were being employed. He likewise inquired about the health of His Holiness, Pope John — an indication of the sympathetic atmosphere of the conversation.

Subsequently, the metropolitans who make up the Holy Synod arrived to greet the papal mission, and the Patriarch explained briefly to them the subjects touched upon in the preceding discussion.

The leave-taking was as cordial as the arrival and was accompanied by the same marks of honor. All together, the visit at the Phanar lasted about an hour.

In the afternoon of the same day, a representation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate repaid the visit at the seat of the Apostolic

Delegation in Istanbul. The Orthodox leaders who called were: the Metropolitan of Neo-Caesarea, Mgr. Chrysostom Koroneos; the Metropolitan of Imroz and Tenedos, Mgr. Meliton; the Metropolitan of Myra, Mgr. Chrysostom Konstantinidis; and the chief secretary of the Holy Synod, Mgr. Symeon Amaryllos. During the encounter there was a clear explanation given of the functions and attributions of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, presided over by Cardinal Bea, and the Preparatory Commission for the Eastern Churches, headed by Cardinal Cicognani, together with the unity section of this latter commission — an exposition which proved to be highly interesting to the Orthodox prelates who called at the Delegation.

On the following Thursday, the three members of the papal mission were invited to the patriarchal Seminary of Halki, where they were dinner guests of His Beatitude, the Patriarch Athenagoras. Upon their departure, as a further mark of esteem, the Patriarch presented them with a large icon — an excellent copy of that of St. John who appears prominently on the iconostasis of the Church of the Patriarchate.

* * *

Suggestions on Ecumenical Council Being Received in Rome from Orthodox and Protestants.

Protestant and Orthodox groups are informing the Holy See about what they think should be discussed at the coming general council of the Catholic Church. And the Holy See is grateful for these suggestions, according to an American priest who is helping prepare for the council.

Father Thomas Stransky, of the Society of St. Paul, said that the suggestions are coming at the express invitation of the Vatican authorities. They are arriving in a steady number at the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, of which Father Stransky is a staff member. «We have already received many such suggestions, and we hope history will say we have used them wisely», he declared. The Christian Unity secretariat is one of the bodies set up by His Holiness Pope John XXIII to prepare for the Second Vatican Council.

Father Stransky spoke at a press conference in Washington at the end of May after his arrival from Rome on his way to Milwaukee. Representatives of Baptist and Lutheran organizations, the National Council of Churches and the Jewish Community Council, as well as reporters from the major press services, attended the conference.

A frequent proposal of non-Catholics is that the council thrash out the problem of tolerance: how to reconcile the demands of truth with the rights of those in error. Another suggested topic is the related problem of the Church's status with the State. Still another is the layman's role in the Church.

The spokesman for the Unity Secretariat said that he could not reveal the suggestions more specifically or name the groups that had offered them, because the Holy See considers the matter confidential. With regard to the possibility of non-Catholic observers at the council, Fr. Stransky said that as yet their role has not yet been decided. He said further that if any non-Catholic observers are invited, the invitations will be sent out without publicity.

« The age of the counter-Reformation is over », Fr. Stransky declared. « The main lines of argument in the counter-Reformation always centered on points of difference between Catholics and Protestants. Now we have entered a period of common reflection on the nature of Christianity itself. We have come gradually to realize that the division of Christianity is a scandal, and a contradiction of Christ's will ' that they may be one ' » (*NC*).

* * *

Coming Council Viewed as Paving the Way for a Council Uniting Christianity

An expert on non-Catholic Christianity has told newspapermen from five nations that the coming ecumenical council may pave the way for a council of Christian unification.

Father Thomas Sartory of the Benedictine Order, editor of the review *Una Sancta* which deals with Catholic-Protestant relations, was addressing a meeting at Seckau, Austria, of Catholic journalists and publishers. The 85 representatives of the press, all German-speaking, came from Austria, Germany, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and Italy.

Father Sartory opened his lecture by quoting His Holiness Pope John XXIII on the council now in preparation: « The task of this council will be to make our house more inviting to others ».

The Benedictine theologian said that the Pope's words indicate that the Church must adapt herself to the requirements of our time. He pointed out that this did not imply any change in the Church's nature or foundation, but rather that the Church explain herself so that non-Catholics can understand her better.

He said this task of self-explanation might be carried out

by the Second Vatican Council, thereby preparing the way for another council which would reunite Christianity.

Another speaker was Father W. Gruber, professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Graz. He asserted that as the agenda of the coming council takes shape, its primary purpose is becoming increasingly clear: to restore to the Church the simplicity and clarity of its early days. (*NC*)

* * *

Russian Orthodox Church Applies for Membership in the World Council of Churches

The Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow and of all Russia has presented an official application for membership in the World Council of Churches. Announcement of this step was made towards the end of April by the general secretary of the W.C.C. Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft. The request of the Russian Church will be considered at the next General Assembly which will take place at New Delhi next November. At that time delegates to the Assembly will, among other things, vote on applications for membership in the World Council, a majority of two-thirds being necessary for approval. A good deal of discussion is expected to center about the request of the Russian Church, but there is no serious doubt about eventual approbation.

The move of the Russian Patriarchate comes as no surprise, for it has been some time now that it has manifested considerable interest in the World Council of Churches. It cannot be denied, of course, that the policy of the Kremlin (the movement for « peace ») in some way influences the request of the Patriarch Alexis; however, there is a positive aspect to the question which also deserves to be emphasized. As Fr. Christopher Dumont of the *Istina* center in Paris wrote in *La Croix*, « it can be foreseen that the active participation of the Russian theologians in the work of the World Council will most effectively strengthen the position occupied by the other Orthodox Churches which are already members. It is characteristic of the Church of Moscow to have taken in its efforts towards restoration the task of re-establishing that which is more profoundly and more genuinely Orthodox in its tradition, with emphasis on theology, on the liturgy, and on spirituality ... Moreover, one can expect that the participation of the Church of Moscow in the World Council will give a formal expression to the unity proper to the Orthodox Church, which up to the present because of unfavorable historical circumstances ... has found it impossible to manifest itself openly

and concretely, with consequent harm to the internal life of those Churches as well as to their irradiation and their external influence ».

« It is in the logic of things », concluded Father Dumont, that the entry of the (Russian) Patriarchate into the World Council will sooner or later bring in other Orthodox churches in Iron Curtain countries. It would be equally logical, in our view, that it should influence the attitude of the Patriarchate towards Rome ».

* * *

Pan-Orthodox Conference Planned for September

After having been twice postponed, the first Pan-Orthodox meeting in 30 years will be held some time in September on the Island of Rhodes. The exact date has not yet been determined. Announcement of the proposed meeting was made at the end of May by Mgr. Spyridon, the Bishop of Rhodes, after consultation with the Ecumenical Patriarch, His All Holiness, Athenagoras I. The last time that an official meeting of Orthodox leaders took place was in 1930 when a Preparatory Prosynod was held at Mount Athos in Greece.

In making his announcement, Mgr. Spyridon said that each of the autocephalous Orthodox churches have been invited to attend and will most probably send delegates. These churches are: the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Serbia, Moscow, Romania, and the Churches of Greece, Cyprus, Bulgaria, and Albania. An invitation will also be extended to the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian Churches to send observers.

The declaration of Mgr. Spyridon stated that despite the continual desire of the autocephalous Orthodox churches to meet together to « renew our fellowship in Christ and the communion of Faith », political difficulties and adverse conditions had prevented them from doing so. It was further stated that the purpose of the meeting in September will not be for the solution of problems, but rather for the exchange of views and for the study of the activity of the Orthodox churches, especially from the point of view of their relationship with the ecumenical movement. (*EPS*)

* * *

Former Anglican Primate Refers to Vatican Secretariat as « An Exciting Advance »

Dr. Geoffrey Fisher has hailed as « an exciting advance » the Holy See's Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Dr. Fisher

expressed this view in Dublin recently at an assembly of the British Council of Churches of which he has been president. The Council embraces Anglican and Protestant churches in Great Britain and Ireland.

The former Anglican Primate said in his opening address that the entire world has become interested in the cause of Christian unity. Not only Christian churches, but even other religious bodies have been caught up in the feeling that Christian unity has commanding importance for the whole world, he said.

Dr. Fisher, who retired as Archbishop of Canterbury on May 31, paid tribute to the « extraordinary hospitality of the Irish people ». The British Council of Churches was meeting for the first time in Dublin since it was founded in 1942.

The Council's general secretary, the Reverend Kenneth Slack, dealt in his report with Dr. Fisher's « courageously imaginative tour to the Holy Land and Rome », where he met and conversed with His Holiness, Pope John XXIII on December 2 of last year. This tour, said Mr. Slack, « became a pilgrimage through which barriers were broken down ».

Referring to the setting up of the Vatican Secretariat for Unity, the Council's secretary asserted that this does not mean any departure by Rome from her unique claims. Nevertheless, he said, the Council welcomed the prospect of official Catholic observers at the World Council of Churches' coming Assembly at New Delhi late this fall. (*NC*)

* * *

Cardinal Bea Meets with Anglican Liaison Officer in Rome

Augustin Cardinal Bea, president of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, recently held an hour-long meeting with Canon Bernard C. Pawley, whom the Church of England has named as permanent liaison officer with the secretariat. The meeting took place at Cardinal Bea's residence a fortnight after Canon Pawley arrived in Rome to take up his new post.

Although there was no statement released to the press following the discussion, Rome's Catholic Action newspaper, *Il Quotidiano,* reported that the two churchmen discussed Canon Pawley's role in relation to the secretariat. Citing unidentified « trustworthy sources », the paper said that Cardinal Bea assured the Anglican representative of « every understanding » on his own part and of all possible « factual assistance and facilities ».

Canon Pawley, treasurer of Ely Cathedral, was named to his new post by the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York

last February. Authorities of the Church of England declared at that time that he would « be available for information in response to the request of the Roman Catholic secretariat for closer contact and better understanding with the non-Roman Catholic churches ». (*NC*)

* * *

New Anglican Primate Will Continue Efforts for Christian Unity

Dr. A. Michael Ramsey, who was enthroned as the new Archbishop of Canterbury on June 27, has declared his intention of working for the union of the various Christian bodies of the world. He acknowledged, however, that there are serious difficulties with regard to the Church of Rome.

During the course of a television interview, Dr. Ramsey said: « We must press on with the work of Christian unity. It can be done. I mean to do it. But if you look on the Church of Rome as a complete system, standing against ours, there is a big gulf because their system is an absolutely complete one allowing for the existence of no other church in the world at all.

« While there is that gulf between the two complete systems, if you look within their church and within ours, there are a great many things which are similar; and there can be common interest and discussion », Dr. Ramsey concluded. (*C. Times*)

* * *

Important Unity Conference Takes Place at Graymoor

Sponsored by the Society of the Atonement at its motherhouse at Graymoor, Garrison, New York, an ecumenical conference entitled « Approaches to Christian Unity » took place from May 3 to 5. Placed under the patronage of Our Lady of the Atonement, it was attended for the most part by about 120 Catholics clergymen from the United States, distinguished for their interest in the field of Christian unity. Among these were representatives of every major religious order in the nation. Likewise present to deliver papers were three prominent Catholic ecumenists from abroad: Msgr. G. M. J. Willebrands of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J. of Rome, and Fr. Bernard Leeming, S. J., of England.

A letter of His Holiness Pope John XXIII was read towards the beginning of the three-day conference in which he expressed his interest and good wishes and in which he imparted his Apostolic Benediction to the participants.

A message was likewise received from His Eminence Augustine Cardinal Bea, praising the initiative of the Atonement Friars. His letter read in part: « The great concern for Unity has made gigantic strides, especially among Catholics, from the moment the Vicar of Christ on earth himself announced a Council. Although the Council is not directly a council of Unity, it must nevertheless by its very being constitute a kindly invitation to seek again that unity which Jesus so ardently implored. At this word of the Supreme Pontiff, the entire Christian world became alert to hear and to act for a more sincere and ardent quest for Unity. Indeed, we are not dealing with an objective whose complete realization is near, but even so, it is no less urgent to carry on the work with ardor and energy, inspired by the very Divine Heart of the Founder of the Church. The time is very propitious; the eyes of the world are turned upon the Christians; a great and unique occasion is offered them for displaying the unifying and pacifying force of Christianity, that is, of Christ and of His Holy Spirit ».

One of the high lights of the conference was the presentation for the first time of the Father Paul Award for distinguished service in the field of Christian unity. Its initial recipient was Fr. Charles Boyer, the editor of *Unitas*, who received the award from the hands of Fr. Angelus Delahunt, S. A.

Plans are under way to publish the proceedings of the Graymoor conference in book form, and it is expected that the volume will be ready towards the end of this year *.

* * *

Lutheran Theologian Sees Crisis in Ecumenical Movement

Contemporary Protestantism's loss of « the ability to think dogmatically has brought about a crisis within the ecumenical movement as the World Council of Churches prepares for its Third World Assembly, a leading conservative Lutheran theologian has declared.

Writing in the April 10 issue of *Christianity Today*, Dr. Hermann Sasse of Australia said: « Modern Protestantism is no longer able to confess the (Nicene) Creed which all great Protestant churches theoretically have in common with all Catholic churches, East and West ». *Christianity Today*, published in Washington, D. C., is an independent fortnightly sponsored by the Evangelical wing of American Protestantism.

---

* A more complete account and commentary on this conference will be found in the documentary section of this issue of *Unitas*.

« Should ever the day come », wrote Dr. Sasse, « when this great ecumenical creed ... becomes again a living confession, there will be a basis for a sound ecumenical movement in a federation of Christian churches ». This is the view expressed by the German-born theologian in an article entitled: « Facing New Delhi: Crisis of the Ecumenical Movement ».

Recalling his activity within the Faith and Order Movement for a period of ten years, Dr. Sasse noted that « the World Conference of Lausanne (1927) recommended as a minimum requirement of unity the common acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds ». He pointed out, further, that a suggestion was made likewise at the World Council of Churches' Constituent Assembly in 1948 at Amsterdam that the Nicene Creed be made the basis of the World Council.

But the Protestantism of our day, he charged, lacks « that amount of consensus in the recognition of an objective truth that is binding on us all » and which distinguished « our fathers at the time of the Reformation, in spite of all the controversies that divided 16th century Christendom ».

Asserting that « we are no longer able to reject error and heresy », the noted theologian accused modern ecumenical organs of attempting to achieve doctrinal agreement by compromise. He characterized the proposed new definition of the W. C. C.'s new basis as « theologically quite insufficient and in its ambiguity misleading ». He then went on to warn the Commission on Faith and Order that « no true unity can ever be attained through its present methods of compromise ».

Before Lausanne, continued Dr. Sasse, the Faith and Order movement spent time trying to find the truth and did not hasten to reach a common definition of « the unity we seek ». Nevertheless, by the time of that conference in 1927, « the great problem of the ecumenical movement was: who would prevail — the negotiators (of church union) or the seekers for truth? »

« Ten years later ... when Life and Work and Faith and Order began to grow together in the World Council of Churches, it was clear that the future would belong to the practical work of uniting the churches. The oecumenical movement became in the Protestant churches a union movement on an unprecedented scale ». (*Lutheran World Federation*)

* * *

Commission on Faith and Order Has New Director

Dr. Paul S. Minear of Yale Divinity School has been named director of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches. Beginning with July 1, his new duties will find him at the World Council headquarters at Geneva from where he will supervise the work of the Commission which deals with the theological and practical problems impeding the attainment of Christian unity. His new post confers on him the direction of a body of 100 theologians and church leaders from all over the world who represent the Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant traditions.

Dr. Minear is an expert in ecumenical matters, having taken part in numerous sessions of the World Council. A speaker at the International Missionary Conference at Willingen, Germany, in 1952, a delegate at the Lund Conference of Faith and Order in 1952, and a consultant at the Evanston Assembly of the W. C. C. in 1954, Dr. Minear was also secretary for study and program of the North American Faith and Order Conference held at Oberlin, Ohio, in September, 1957. Bringing together some 300 American and Canadian church leaders and theologians, the Oberlin Conference is considered a landmark on the road to Christian unity in North America. The new director has likewise served as chairman of the committee which prepared the study material on the theme of the Third Assembly of the World Council to be held in New Delhi, India, from November 18 to December 6.

Dr. Minear has been granted a leave of absence by the Yale University Divinity School where he became professor of Biblical theology and of the New Testament in 1956. He had previously taught at Andover Newton Theological Seminary, Garrett Biblical Institute, and at the Hawaii School of Religion. (*EPS*)

* * *

Editor Notes Hopeful Signs on Way to Church Unity

A renewed interest among Protestant leaders in making more precise just what they believe and a new appreciation among them of the Eucharist as the center of Christian life are hopeful signs on the way to Church unity, a Catholic editor in Cincinnati has declared.

Speaking at the Grail Center in Cincinnati recently, Fr. Raymond T. Bosler, editor of the *Criterion,* Indianapolis Catholic weekly, said: « Just as the disciples on the road to Emmaus recognized

Christ in the breaking of the bread, Protestants too will find Christ in the Church through knowing Him in the Eucharist ».

Father Bosler said that tradition, too, is receiving more attention from Protestant theologians, even though this has not yet made itself felt to any great extent among the average Protestant minister or layman. Nevertheless, all of this represents a significant change in Protestant attitudes, according to the Cincinnati priest.

One of the important points made in Fr. Bosler's address was that Catholics themselves have to know what they believe if they are going to promote church unity. He indicated that the doctrine of papal infallibility, for example, often met with definite Protestant opposition because some Catholics seem to interpret it too broadly. « Catholics must understand what is of the essence and what is not », he said, if they hope to present a correct image of the Catholic Church to Protestants.

* * *

Protestant Insight into Divine Revelation Called Aid to Catholics

Catholics may well « profit from the insight of Protestants into divine revelation », a priest who is consultant to the unity Secretariat for the coming ecumenical council recently declared in Toronto in an address prior to his departure for Rome.

« We can never learn from specifically Protestant principles », said Father Gregory Baum of the Augustinian Order, but « we may be reminded » by Protestants « of elements of our Catholic past, elements we have forgotten or neglected ».

Father Baum explained that the ecumenical movement of Protestant origin had changed the theological atmosphere among Protestant churches, and between Protestant communities and the Catholic Church.

This new approach is based on the acknowledgment that all Christians, all baptized men believing in Christ, are brothers, he stated.

He pointed out that in various Protestant churches there is a new appreciation of the eucharistic liturgy as a vehicle of Christ's presence in the community.

« In Catholic theology over the last thirty years », he said, « our sacramental notions of ' real presence ' and ' sacrifice ' have been integrated into a more complete, more Biblical and liturgical vision of the Eucharist. We are not as far apart as we were in the past ».

Father Baum also stated: « While the Protestant communities as bodies have cut themselves off from the one Church to whom the fulfillment has been given — this is the Catholic view — the Holy Spirit keeps on stirring individual Protestants to holiness and to prophetic utterance. Often these prophetic messages are destined to recall us Catholics to a greater fidelity to the Word of God ». (*NC*)

* * *

Australian Catholic and Protestant Leaders Join in Prayer Appeal

Special Industrial Sunday services were held in churches throughout Victoria State after Melbourne's Catholic Archbishop joined eight Protestant leaders in appealing for such a commemoration.

Signers of the appeal included Catholic Archbishop Daniel Mannix of Melbourne, Anglican Archbishop Frank Woods of Melbourne, and the local heads of the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and Lutheran churches. Industrial Sunday falls on the first Sunday after May Day, the feast of St. Joseph the Worker.

The churchmen's declaration read: « We appeal for prayer —

« 1. That all sections of our industrial community may be given a new vision of their task in terms of community service and of craftsmanship rather than of profit and pay only.

« 2. For the grace of Almighty God and the gift of His Holy Spirit that Christians may learn to work out the implications of their faith in the light of the skills and techniques which industrial life has bestowed upon the community. Industry, as other spheres of life, needs Christians of the highest motives, the strictest ethics, and the deepest unselfishness.

« 3. That all men everywhere may learn to treat their brothers as of equal dignity and worth in the sight of God ». (*NC*)

* * *

Annual Seminary Publication Dedicates Number to Eastern Churches

At-one-ment, an annual review of studies in Christian unity, has dedicated its current issue to various aspects of the separated Eastern churches and their relationship with the Church of Rome. The periodical is sponsored by the Major Seminary of the Society of the Atonement in Washington, D. C., and is intended to be

primarily a source of information on ecumenism for seminarians. It is now in its third year of publication, and has met with an enthusiastic response from seminary students of many different countries.

An idea of the matter treated in the third volume of *At-one-ment* can be had from a listing of the titles of the various articles which are in order: « The Catholic Eastern Rites », « The Eastern Schism », « A General View of Orthodoxy », « A Chart of the Dissident Eastern Churches », « Orthodox Centers of Learning and Some of Their Leading Theologians », « Doctrinal Divergencies between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church », « Agreement on the ' Filioque ' as the Basis of Union at the Council of Florence », « An Ecumenical Council in Graeco-Russian Theology », « The Theory of Sobornost », « Recent Ecumenical Ventures between Orthodox and Protestants », « The Work of the Church for the Oriental Disisdents ».

The current issue of *At-one-ment* ends with a disting of documents of the Holy See relating to Eastern Catholics and to those of the separated Eastern churches, and a selected biography of books, articles, and pamphlets dealing with related subjects.

* * *

Presbyterians Seek Merger of Four Major Protestant Churches

The United Presbyterian Church in the United States has voted to open talks aimed at unifying four Protestant denominations into one church with 18,000,000 members.

This action was taken at the Presbyterians' 173rd general assembly held in Buffalo, New York, late in May. The resolution calling for the discussions was an outcome of a sermon given last December by Eugene Carson Blake, Presbyterian Stated Clerk, which appealed for unification of the 3,200,000-member Presbyterian Church with the Methodist Church (9,800,000 members), the Episcopal Church (3,200,000), and the United Church of Christ (2,200,000). The suggestion was supported by Episcopal Bishop James A. Pike of California.

The talks were authorized by the general assembly to seek « the establishment of a united church, truly catholic, truly reformed and truly evangelical ». (*B. Pilot*).

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Beginning of Ecumenical Council Seen for Autumn of 1962

The Second Vatican Council may begin in the autumn of 1962 if preparations continue to be as successful as they have been up until now, the secretary of the Council's central preparatory commission has stated.

Archbishop Pericle Felici told a press conference in Vatican City that so far preparations are progressing rapidly and satisfactorily. He noted that His Holiness Pope John XXIII has said that all the members of the various preparatory commissions must have freedom of expression so that the voice of the bishops will reach the Pope clearly. This, he added, refutes the charge that the coming ecumenical council will reflect only the opinions of members of the Church's administrative staff at the Vatican.

Archbishop Felici said that the Pope's visits to various commission meetings are a means of encouraging and thanking members of the commissions. He explained that the council will not discuss matters already decided on by previous councils and Church law, such as the celibacy of the clergy.

The Central Commission, he went on, has studied at length how the council will be organized and who will be invited. Non-catholic observers may attend the council, he said.

Latin will be the language of the council, Archbishop Felici stated, but if a bishop cannot express himself in Latin, he may be allowed to use another language. He also reiterated that a press office for the council will be set up when there is information available for distribution to the press.

With the approach of Pentecost meanwhile, Pope John appealed to the Bishops of the Catholic world for further prayers for the success of the Second Vatican Council. In an apostolic letter entitled *Celebrandi Concilii Oecumenici*, the Pope observed: « Since the preparatory work of the council is becoming more intense and since one feels a need to multiply prayers more urgently, We wish the forthcoming feast of Pentecost to be pre-

ceded, as is customary, by a solemn novena of prayers to be celebrated throughout the whole Church in union with Us with fervent entreaties to the Holy Spirit that He may help in a special way those people who are working diligently for the preparation of the council, that the Divine Paraclete, the living source, fire and charity, may enlighten their minds and fill them with supernatural grace ».

In conclusion the Pope also urged that the Catholic faithful to invoke the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary whom he has declared patroness of the council. (*Oss. Romano*)

Catholic and non-Catholic Scholars Complete Volume for Vatican Library

Twenty-two scholars representing the three major faiths in the United States have completed a volume that will be presented to the Vatican Library. The volume, which is entitled *Didascaliae,* is made up of over 650 pages, and consists of work in the field of the humanities that was compiled from material found mainly in the Vatican Library.

Mr. Sesto Prete, editor of the volume and professor of classics at Fordham University, said that the work will probably be presented in September to Abbot Anselm D. Albareda, of the Benedictine Order, prefect of the Vatican Library, at a ceremony in the American Academy of Rome. It deals with problems in classical Greek and Latin philology, medieval scholarship, paleography, history, Renaissance studies, Byzantine literature, and library science. The work of compiling the volume was launched in October, 1959, when Abbot Albareda spoke at the dedication of the Library of Philosophical Science and of the Pius XII Memorial Library in St. Louis.

Mr. Prete explained that the word *Didascaliae* refers to an ancient form of cataloguing manuscripts of ancient comedies that listed the basic information about a manuscript, its authorship, content, and ownership.

* * *

FRANCE

Cardinal Tisserant Named to the French Academy

On the fifteenth of June, with an almost unanimous vote of of approval — an occurrence which had not been verified for a long time — the French Academy named as one of its members

His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals, and Bishop of Ostia, Porto, and Santa Rufina. The well known prelate succeeds Duke Maurice de Broglie and is outstanding in the scientific world for his works, especially for his Oriental writings.

The election of Cardinal Tisserant recalls the names of other noted ecclesiastics who were members of the celebrated society founded by Cardinal Armand Duplessis de Richelieu in 1635. There have been 130 clergymen who have belonged to the French Academy since its inception, among them being: Bossuet, Fénelon, Fléchier, Massillon, Dupanloup, Lacordaire, Duchesne, Brémond, and Cardinals Mathieu, Baudrillart, and Grente. The name of Cardinal Tisserant, an eminent scholar in Oriental languages, is thus joined to these names rendered illustrious for their various contributions to religious and humanistic endeavours.

June 15 also marked the 25th anniversary of Cardinal Tisserant's elevation to the Sacred College, and for the occasion he received an autographed letter of felicitation from His Holiness Pope John XXIII, composed in elegant Latin. (*Civiltà Cattolica*)

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Noted Catholic Historian Discusses Restoration of Christian Elements in Education

British historian Christopher Dawson, in a lecture at Grailville Community College in Ohio, said that « a new generation of Catholic scholars is needed to restore the Christian insights to our educational tradition ».

« I believe », said Mr. Dawson, « that Western civilization can only be saved from going the same way as Russia and Germany did by ... redirecting the whole system (of education) towards its spiritual end ». He admitted, however, that this would be a very formidable task.

« The process of secularization has gone so far », he said, « that few people are conscious of the absence of spiritual purpose or of the need for any program of higher religious studies ». In consequence, he was of the opinion that little would be done until a curriculum of such studies were restored for the laity — a consecutive course of religious studies for both the high school and university level.

« Today », he noted « it may seem ... impracticable to look for the establishment of higher religious instruction in the universities, but the need is so pressing and the consequences of neglect so appalling that I believe it will be met by a new intellectual apostolate, a new generation of Catholic scholars ».

Tracing the loss of the « Christian insights » of university education, Mr. Dawson recalled that « in the traditional Christian university the curriculum was an integral part, but was not the end, of the system; the end was a spiritual and esthetic one ... But the modern university is an intellectual workshop or factory which turns out specialists by the thousands. It does not develop as a unique self-sufficient whole like the old universities ».

Mr. Dawson predicted that if the modern university is left to go its own way, it « will use up or destroy the individuality of the student in the pursuit of knowledge, as the totalitarian state destroys the individuality of the citizen in the pursuit of power ». (*NC*)

Protestant Church Council Urges « Appreciation of Religion » in Schools

The Maryland Council of Churches has urged that public schools teach children « respect and appreciation for the contributions of religion to life ».

The council said it would be a « matter of grave import » if the public schools were to be « silent as to the pertinence of moral and spiritual values to our American life and institutions, or as to the role of religious organizations in the establishment and preservation of those values ».

The Protestant group's statements were contained in a report drawn up after three months of study by a special committee headed by the Reverend Harold Hodgson, minister of the Howard Park Methodist Church. The study was undertaken as a result of recent court controversies over Bible reading in Baltimore public schools. The practice has been upheld by the Superior Court.

The council said that sectarian teaching in public schools would be a violation of the Constitution, as well as controversial in a religiously pluralistic society. But, it added, « teaching our children respect and appreciation for the contributions of religion to life need not be inconsistent with legal requirements and in the public interest ».

« The council pretends to no wisdom as to educational methods but it believes this is not beyond the capabilities of the administrators and teachers in our public schools », it said.

ENGLAND

Prime Minister Sees World Struggle Ending when Communists Pose Questions of Man and God

Britain's prime minister has predicted that the free world's struggle with communism will end not when hydrogen bombs destroy both camps but when communists ask themselves the meaning of life.

Prime Minister Harold Macmillan told a nationally televised press conference recently that Western strategy should be to « hold on » until the communists begin asking themselves the right questions about the purpose of life, the meaning of sin, and of God.

In reply to a question on the relative power of the communist world and the free world, Mr. Macmillan said that both sides could destroy the other, but that the « contest will be in another field, partly technical, partly material, but partly for the souls of men. For what in the end is the purpose of life? ».

« Surely », concluded the prime minister, « our job is to hold on long enough so that some questions that men always ask each other in the end will be asked: Why are we here? Is there a right and wrong? Is there sin? Does God exist? These questions will be asked — and I think are being asked — in the communist society. If we can hold on long enough, then we have won our freedom and theirs ». (*C. Herald*)

* * *

THE NETHERLANDS

Seven Cathedrals Linked in Pentecost Broadcast

Catholic bishops in seven European countries were linked in a single radio broadcast on Pentecost Sunday. In each of these countries a bishop delivered a short sermon on the Holy Spirit in his own language and called for prayers for the success of the coming ecumenical council. In each cathedral, the congregation also sang one stanza of the invocation to the Holy Ghost, *Veni Creator Spiritus.*

The program was broadcast by the Dutch Catholic Radio Corporation in Hilversum and was rebroadcast by the French and Belgian networks.

The bishops who took part were: Bernard Cardinal Alfrink Archbishop of Utrecht; Maurice Cardinal Feltin, Archbishop of

Paris; Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo; Archbishop Benediktos Printesis of Athens; Bishop Michael Keller of Muenster; Bishop Knut Nelson of Stockholm, and Bishop Francis Walsh of Aberdeen. (*La Croix*)

* * *

ITALY

3000 University Students Take Part in March of Faith

Three thousand university students walked in a fifteen-mile procession from Castellina Scalo to Siena in the fourth annual March of Faith late in April. The march was sponsored by the « For a Christian Commonwealth » movement, which seeks to restore Christian values in all phases of man's contemporary life.

Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna, celebrated Mass for the students during which a letter written in the name of His Holiness Pope John XXIII by the Vatican Secretary of State, Domenico Cardinal Tardini, was read. It thanked the students for offering their march for the success of the forthcoming ecumenical council.

Besides those from Italy, students from several European countries and Japan. Guatemala, India, Australia, Brazil, and Paraguay took part in the procession. (*La Rocca*)

* * *

HUNGARY

Vatican Newpaper Denies Reports of Better Church-State Relations

L'Osservatore Romano has editorially refuted reports of coexistence between the Church and the communist regime in Hungary, and has stated that « a great number » of the clergy are in Hungarian prisons. The front-page editorial, written by an expert on Iron Curtain affairs, said that Hungary's situation remains « most grave ».

« How can the hypocritical administration in Hungary speak of good relations between Church and State in that country when every day there is a new development in their oppression against Catholics? » the newspaper asked.

« A great number of churchmen — no one knows precisely how many — are imprisoned », the editorial stated. « No one has been able to communicate with them since the time of their arrest, not even their families or their lawyers ».

The Hungarian regime meanwhile has tried to impose upon Catholics the leadership of the so-called « peace priests », the *Osservatore* revealed. The communist regime often points to an agreement supposedly signed by Hungary's bishops in 1950, in which they agreed to oppose fully any action contrary to the security of the State, and condemned « irresponsible elements in the service of the Church with political hostility to the State ».

Nevertheless, the Vatican newspaper affirmed, only one bishop signed this alleged agreement. The others did not know of its publication, it said.

The editorial concluded by saying: « The antireligious war continues without truce, implacable in full response to Marxist ideology and with firm determination to put it into practice ».

* * *

CANADA

Anglican Bishops Laud Classes in Religion in Ontario Schools

Anglican Church bishops in a joint pastoral letter recently asserted that « no country can hope to survive if the spiritual principles of the Judaeo-Christian inheritance are not taught each generation ».

The bishops said that they favored the present formula on religious instruction in Ontario province public schools, and fully supported teaching the Bible in the schools. The pastoral letter congratulated the Ontario Legislature and the Department of Education for « having introduced religious instruction into the schools seventeen years ago and having maintained it since then ». (*NC*)

* * *

AUSTRALIA

Revolution in Catholic Attitudes Seen by Journalist

A revolution is under way in the Catholic stance before the world and before non-Catholic Christians, a priest-journalist has told his Catholic colleagues in Melbourne.

Father James Murtagh, first president of Australia's Catholic Press Association, told the organization's seventh annual convention that the coming ecumenical council may set the Church's seal upon this revolution.

« The Church has entered the Age of Dialogue and the Age of Public Relations — dialogue with non-Catholic Christians and public relations with the community at large », he declared.

« I do not think it an exaggeration to say that we are on the threshold of a revolution in Catholic attitudes and policies in the Church's confrontation with the world. The revolution has already begun. It may well be signed and sealed and directed at the Second Vatican Council and will mark the end of the Reformation Era ».

Father Murtagh said the change in attitude toward non-Catholic Christians began quietly in Germany about 30 years ago and spread to other European countries of mixed religion. He said it is just beginning in Australia.

Today it is « inspired by a desire for the unity of Christendom in the face of the growing power of the empire of the godless », he declared.

« The whole question of ' dialogue ' and ecumenicism bristles with difficulties », continued Father Murtagh. « The council will doubtless lay down the conditions and limitation of the Protestant-Catholic ' dialogue ' and will clarify the relations between the Church and State in pluralist secular democracies like ours, and other questions of special interest to the Catholic press.

« When the directives of the council are handed down, they may well call for a considerable readjustment of attitudes and ideas and the deliberate re-setting of editorial sights », he predicted. (*NC*)

* * *

SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa Archbishop Calls on Religious Leaders to Oppose Nation's Racial Segregation

In the wake of a conference at Pietermaritzburg, which appealed for a complete reversal of South Africa's race segregation policies, the Catholic Archbishop of Durban has asked the nation's religious leaders to join in an all-out drive on racism.

Archbishop Denis E. Hurley, O.M.I., said that he seeks the formation of a council composed of well-known Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Moslem representatives. His appeal, published in the Johannesburg *Sunday Times*, was an elaboration of one he made a few days earlier at a multiracial meeting at Natal University.

The latter meeting, known as the Natal Convention, was conceived as the first move towards an All-South Africa National Convention. The three-day session was convened by Dr. Edgar Brookes, head of the department of history and political science

at Natal University. Archbishop Hurley played a leading role in the conference. He delivered the concluding address and presented the final report to the 600 delegates who filled the hall of the university.

The report called for a reversal of the racial policies which are a major facet of South Africa's nationalist government. Among the points stressed in the report are the following:

— Race separation as a policy must be rejected and replaced by a policy of « true national unity ».

— The right to vote must be granted on an equal basis without regard to race.

— Racial integration in education is the ideal.

The report presented by Archbishop Hurley stated: « The Natal Convention, meeting at a moment of grave and urgent crisis, has nevertheless proved a most happy experience for those participating in it ... The cooperative attitude of its members of all races has shown significantly the truth that genuine good will is met by good will.

« Nevertheless, it was obvious to all the delegates that there is a desperate need for change and adjustment to change if South Africa is to avert racial and economic disaster. Acceptance of these facts is essential if real racial cooperation and a truly prosperous and stable society are to be achieved ...

« The work of consultation begun at these meetings in friendship must be maintained through the stirring and decisive years ahead ». (*Fides*)

* * *

PALESTINE

An Inscription Bearing Name of Pilate Discovered at Caesarea

An Italian archaeological expedition, headed by Dr. Antonio Frova of Milan, has uncovered at Caesarea a Latin inscription bearing the name of Pontius Pilate. Up until the present, the name of the Roman procurator of Judaea (from 26 to 36 A. D.) appeared only in the Gospels and in the works of the historian Flavius Josephus.

The inscription was engraved on a stone slab measuring 60 centimeters by 80 found in the zone of a Roman amphytheater, and consists of three lines. The name of Pontius Pilate is found in the second line. It is presumed that the slab made up part of the inscription at the base of a statue erected before some public building in Caesarea. (*Oss. Romano*)

BOOK REVIEWS

FRANCIS CLARK, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Darton Longman & Todd Ltd. London and The Newman Press - Westminster, Md. 582 pages. 50 shills.

My name appears in the foreword of this book, under the heading ' Thanks ', and justly, for not only did I read the work in typescipt, but I was in a mild degree responsible for its ever having been projected, when in conversation with the author I once suggested that I should be grateful for a full and scholarly examination of the abuses alleged against the Church's Eucharistic doctrine and practice, that are said to have been prevalent on the eve of the Reformation. I had often seen in Anglican explanations of the origin of the Communion service and the Ordinal (but chiefly the former) references to abuses, which were rarely specified, yet which apparently were grave enough to justify the change, four centuries ago, of the Mass into « The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse », and then into « The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion », no longer commonly called the Mass. I did not, of course, believe that any ' abuses ', if such had existed and had in truth been enormous, could ever really justify such a complete and radical change as that implied by the difference between the Catholic Mass and the Anglican Holy Communion; they might, however, have made the phenomenon more excusable. I wished, therefore, to know what was alleged in the way of abuses and, if possible, the degree to which the allegations were true.

In this book Fr. Clark has met my desires fully. He has collected from a wide reading of Anglican works what one imagines must be the complete list of excesses, whether in practices, credulities, or theological teaching, attributed to the Church of the eve of the Reformation. Then he has traced in many cases the origins of the accusations that have been made, examined the theological writings and sermons of the teachers who, it is said, were at fault, and tried to assess the real value of the superstitions and facile beliefs of that time. The results are what

one expected, that there has been a great deal of exaggeration. The standard teaching about the Eucharist and the Mass, even of the Nominalists, was unenterprisingly traditional. Some of the 'abuses' had their origin in wild and unfounded accusations thrown out in the acrimonius controversies of the Reformation period. Superstitions there were, or rather devotions concentrating too much on one aspect of the truth to the neglect of others, and perhaps Fr. Clark, concentrating more on theology than history, has minimised these unduly. People rarely received Holy Communion (a defect common till the beginning of this century in the West and still common in the Orthodox Churches); the Mass was so associated with Christ's Passion as practically to exclude reference to other mysteries of His life (a fault, granted, but on the theologically right side); the Blessed Sacrament was regarded more as a 'Real Presence' than as a sacrament of Holy Communion; Requiem and other votive Masses were multiplied and endued with an almost magical efficacy for the attainment of specific intentions and tended to become a substitute for personal holiness. In each case, it is the truth out of balance; but the cure, surely, is not to deny the truth but only to restore the balance. Yet the Reformation, also in England, while aiming at promoting frequent Communion, denied both the Mass and the Real Presence, and was left with a commemoration service of prayer.

Another of the charges levelled at pre-Reformation theologians concerns the very notion of 'destruction'. That question in the Catholic Church is really post- not pre- Tridentine, but Fr. Clark uses it to describe Catholic theories of the essence of the sacrifice of the Mass, even the most modern. This excursus into recent theology is useful for two reasons — it fits in with the general theme of the book, i. e. it meets criticism of our Catholic doctrine offered by non-Catholics, and it is most informative to the reader who will not easily find elsewhere so clear and compact an account of Catholic thought on the sacrificial aspect of the Mass.

In summary, it can fairly be said that the general teaching about the Mass of the pre-Reformation period was above reproach, and that, in so far as there was abuse, it was in a lack of balance in the practice of the time. The Reformers, as contemporaries of the theory and the practice of that day, knew the situation more accurately than their modern followers. When, then, they changed the traditional teaching and practice of England (which was the traditional teaching and practice of the universal Church), it was, unfortunately, not to rid themselves of abuses about the Mass, but to rid themselves of the Mass as an abuse, and to

deny the real Presence of Christ in Holy Communion. Abbot Fakenham, another contemporary, put the issue into plain words in a speech against the Bill of Uniformity that he made in the House of Lords in 1539. Referring to the reign of Edward VI, he said: « Every other year having a new Book devised thereof ... The first Book affirming the Seven Sacraments, and the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Holy Eucharist; the other denying the same. The one Book admitting the real Presence of Christ's Body in the said Sacrament to be received in one Kind with kneeling down, and great Reverence done into it, and that in unleavened Bread; and the other Book would have the Communion received in both the Kinds and in Loaf Bread, without any Reverence, but only unto the Body of Christ in Heaven ». In Elizabeth's reign the Reformers, who knew the character of the two Books of Common Prayer as well as Fakenham, had the choice between them. They chose the second Book, and their choice is an eloquent and self-sufficient interpretation of their phrase, ' the abuses of Masses '. Fr Clark's study, without meaning to, confirms that interpretation. If there were no flagrant abuses about the Eucharist just before the Reformation (as his investigation shows), then the changes introduced into English Eucharistic practice could not have been to remove ' abuses ' about the Mass, but the Mass itself.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

E. I. WATKIN, *The Church in Council,* Darton, Longman & Todd (London), Sheed & Ward (New York) 1961: 227 pages; price 6 shills.

Interest in the forthcoming council is very strong and a variety of short histories of the councils has appeared to acquaint the interested with what has happened in the past. This particular account is really more than a history of the councils. It is a very brief history of the Church, for it is introduced by a review of events before the first council and then each of the other councils in turn is put into its historical setting, without which in most cases it could hardly be undertsood. The narratives of the events of the councils and their decrees are very brief, sometimes even schematic, but clear, with the stress put in the right places. I cannot say that I agree with all of the author's *obiter dicta,* particularly in some of his résumés of periods, but that does not mean that it is necessarily he that is wrong. I think,

however, that he tends somewhat to form his judgments on the events and personalities of centuries ago by standards current only today.

The author accepts the Council of Constance as oecumenical from its beginning, even when in the fourth and fifth sessions it enunciated the principle of the superiority of council over pope (though he considers the fifth session not conciliar, owing to the absence of most of the cardinals), and states: « There can be little doubt that this was in fact Pope Martin's view ». Surely there is every doubt. Pope Martin, sitting on the edge of the still active volcano, used language that was studiedly non-committal, when he confirmed « whatsoever has been done *conciliariter* concerning the faith ». I see no justification for opposing *conciliariter* to *nationaliter*. If one may take the interpretation of Martin's successor, Eugenius IV, it meant simply « as a general council », for Eugenius denied in several Bulls that the gathering at Constance in the beginning was anything but a meeting of one ' obedience ' out of the three existing at the time, and that without its head, the antipope John XXIII, who had fled.

There is an absence of (what I should say was) necessary punctuation in places and too large a number of misprints, few of which, certainly, distort the sense, though ' Vienna ' for ' Vienne ' (p. 180) may mislead the unwary, and Charlamagne (p. 130) and Alleman (p. 166) are not the usual spellings. There are, also, as might be expected in a work that takes in the whole of Church history in brief, a few mistakes or misdirections, so to speak, of justice. E. g. the word ' noisy ' in the phrase ' A noisy faction of bishops ' (at the bottom of p. 86) condemns men who were probably only trying to keep their episcopal Orders from being impugned by a Patriarch going back on a bargain. Veccus was, at first, one of the leading opponents of the union of Lyons (p. 127). The attachment of the main body of the Maronites to the Holy See had been strong long before the Council of Florence (p. 181): it was a small group of Cypriot Maronites that joined with Rome in 1445.

There is always the danger, as a critic points out a few blemishes in an otherwise excellent work, that his strictures occupy too large a proportion of his review and give, therefore, a false idea of the whole. I do not want to convey that impression here. The book is excellent. The author undertook a very hard task when he set his hand to writing it, for there is nothing so difficult as producing an accurate and proportioned synopsis of a vast subject, with the essentials in high relief and enough of the background to bring out their right and full meaning.

Only the man who is a master of his material can achieve that. The author has accomplished it here, in this account of all the general councils of the Church within the compass of 227 pages. The reader who pays his six shillings for this book is assuredly getting his money's worth — even more, for on p. 27 a line has been printed twice.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

MAURICE VILLAIN, *La Prière de Jesus pour l'unité chrétienne*: Meditation oecumenique sur Jean, XVII. Paris: Casterman, 1960, pp. 148.

Originally Father Villain had reserved this meditation for his circle of friends. He has done well in communicating it to the public. The prayer of Jesus for the unity of those who would believe in Him has not only brought about the unity of the Catholic Church, but has given substance to the hope of leading to this unity those who do not yet belong to the one fold. As a fervent ecumenist, Father Villain explains passage after passage of the sublime prayer of Christ, alternating his exegesis with supplications addressed to the Divine Persons that the scandal of Christian division might cease.

Sustained by the divine text, the author teaches and prays in such a way as to make the reader sense the mystery of the unity possessed and of that which is to be attained. By helping his readers to understand and to pray, he is effectively serving the cause of Christian unity.

The nature of this work would not in itself entail an exposition of the ecumenical method; only brief allusions bring out the stand of the author which, in any case, is well known. In order, however, to prevent every error of interpretation, Father Villain stresses that he has written his book « overlooking nothing of the exigencies of the official teaching regarding the unicity of the Church and her historical conservation within the Church of Peter » (p. 23). It is, in fact, important that this faith of Catholic ecumenists be made known to our separated brethren.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.